



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

ANDOVER-HARVARD LIBRARY



AH 46M9 Z

THE ❁ ❁ ❁
MODE ❁ ❁
OF ❁ ❁ ❁ ❁
CHRISTIAN
BAPTISM ❁

REV. M. M. SMITH

741
S655mo
1899

10 p



THE MODE
OF
CHRISTIAN BAPTISM

BY

REV. M. M. SMITH

A MEMBER OF LOGAN PRESBYTERY OF THE
CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN
CHURCH



NASHVILLE, TENN.
THE CUMBERLAND PRESS
1899

**COPYRIGHTED IN 1899
BY THE BOARD OF PUBLICATION OF THE
CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.**

741
S655mo
1899

CONTENTS.

BAPTO,	1
BAPTIZO,	9
THE BAPTISM OF JOHN,	57
THE BAPTISM OF CHRIST,	62
THE BAPTISM OF PAUL,	73
THE BAPTISM OF THE JAILER,	81
THE BAPTISM OF CORNELIUS,	87
THE BAPTISM OF THE EUNUCH,	92
ROMANS VI. 3, 4,	102
SOME HISTORICAL FACTS CONSIDERED,	123
ADDENDA,	138

PREFACE.

The little book, of which this is a preface, was written because it is needed. I have frequently been asked by members of the church for a book on the mode of baptism, setting forth our views on that subject. And inasmuch as our church has no work on the mode of baptism sufficiently comprehensive, and yet not too large, I have written this to fill the vacancy. A great many Cumberland Presbyterians have heard immersion preached so much, and with such an air of triumph, without anything on the other side, that they have come to the conclusion that pouring or sprinkling are used only as a matter of expediency. They are told in the pulpit, and out of it, that *baptizo* means nothing but dip or immerse, and "your educated men know it." Our preachers have always been too busy preaching the gospel to spend much time in delivering lectures on the mode of baptism. The written page is what we need on this subject. I know of no book in our church or out of it, in which the mode of baptism is as thoroughly discussed, in a small compass, as I have done in this. I have aimed to use the right words, and as few of them as possible, so as to present the facts and arguments at command in a clear and distinct light. The reader can form but little conception of the labor and time spent in collating and arranging the facts as he sees them.

Bowling Green, Ky., September 9, 1899.

BAPTO.

Bapto is a Greek word and is the root of *baptizo*. It is never used in the Greek Testament when speaking of the ordinance of baptism, but it is generally brought into the discussion of the mode of baptism. This is done, I suppose, because of the similarity of meaning in the two words. Some writers claim that the two words are synonymous in meaning. Dr. Gale, a learned Baptist writer of England, says: "I will begin with the words *baptizo* and *bapto*, for they are synonymous" (Reflections on Wall's History of Infant Baptism, p. 60). And the translator of Mark and Luke, for the Baptist translation of the New Testament, says: "It has been settled that there is no difference as to signification between *bapto* and *baptizo*." But Dr. Carson, of Ireland, a Baptist writer, differs from both of these writers. He says: "The primitive word *bapto*, has two significations, the primary to dip, and the secondary to dye" (Mode of Baptism, p. 19). Then on page 44 he says: "From signifying to dip, it came to signify to dye by dipping, because this was the way in which things were usually dyed. And afterward, from dyeing by dipping, it came to denote dyeing in any manner." On page 46 he says: "It is by extension of literal meaning, and not by figure of any kind, that words come to depart so far from their original signification." Then again, on the same page, he says: "*Bapto* signifies to dye by sprinkling, as

properly as by dipping, though originally it was confined to the latter." But Dr. Gale does not admit that *bapto* has any secondary meaning. He says: "It signifies nothing else but to dip" (p. 72). He then undertakes to sustain his position by an appeal to Greek authors themselves. He says: "We will begin with Homer as the most ancient." He then quotes from Homer's poem of the battle of the frogs and mice: "When one of the champions is slain on the bank of a lake, he says: 'He breathless fell, and the lake was tinged (*ebapteto*) with blood.'" Now to dip the lake into the blood of a mouse was certainly a Herculean task, but Dr. Gale, after speaking of the "liberty of poets," and "the nature of all hyperboles," and "the nature of language," says: "The literal sense is, 'The lake was dipped in blood.'" That was certainly a wonderful stretch of the imagination, but his remorseless theory drove him to it. He had just said: "I do not remember one passage, where all other senses are not necessarily excluded besides dipping." But this dipping of a lake in blood was too much for Dr. Carson. He says: "To suppose that there is here any extravagant allusion to the literal immersion or dipping of a lake, is a monstrous perversion of taste" (p. 48). Then on the same page he says: "Never was there such a figure." "The expression is literal, and has not the smallest difficulty" (*ibid*). Then on the same page he says: "The blood was poured into the lake." Now Dr. Carson says: "The expression is literal," then there is no figure or hyperbole in it, and the blood was literally poured into the lake; but as Dr. Carson can see nothing in the case that favors the theory of dip, he thinks there is nothing in it that

favors the other party. Dr. Gale, it will be remembered, says that *bapto* and *baptizo*, are synonymous terms, and if that is so, then we have a case of baptism by pouring as plain as language can make it. Dr. Carson gives some examples to show that Dr. Gale is wrong, in saying that *bapto* never means anything but dip. The first is from Hippocrates where "he employs it to denote dyeing by dropping the dyeing liquid on the thing dyed." The language of Hippocrates is: "When it drops upon the garments they are dyed" (*Bapletai*). Then Carson adds: "This surely is not dyeing by dipping." He gives an example from Arrian's Expedition of Alexander the Great. It is: "Nearchus relates that the Indians dye their beard." Now says Carson, "It will not be contended that they dyed their beard by immersion." He gives also an example from Eschylus. It reads: "This garment, dyed by the sword of Egisthus, is a witness to me." "The garment," says Carson, "must have been dyed by the blood running down over it." This is another case of baptism by pouring. Then Carson quotes the following example, to wit: "Magnes, an old comic poet of Athens, used the Lydian music, shaved his face, and smeared it over with tawny washes." He says: "Now, surely *baptomenos* here has no reference to its primary meaning. Nor is it used figuratively. By anything implied or referred to in this example, it could not be known that *bapto* ever signifies to dip." Carson says that "Dr. Gale gives us another example from Aristotle, which is as little to his purpose, namely, to prove that the word, when it signifies to dye, has always a reference to dipping, and implies it." This is the example, to wit: "If it is pressed, it dyes and

colors the hand." Then he says: "Surely there is no reference to dipping here." In all of these examples Dr. Carson is opposing Dr. Gale, and while he is opposing Dr. Gale, he is establishing the very thing for which we contend, namely, that *bapto* is not a word of one meaning. Now he says: "We have found, beyond reasonable doubt, that *bapto*, in its secondary sense, is employed literally and properly to denote dyeing, even when there is no dipping." He says: "A word may come to enlarge its meaning so as to lose sight of its origin." Then he gives this piece of good instruction to his brethren: This fact, he says, "serves to solve difficulties that have been very clumsily got over by some of the ablest writers on this side of the question." Although Dr. Carson proves beyond all doubt, that *bapto* has a secondary meaning, and that it is as literal as the primary, yet he will not admit that it applies outside of the dyer's art. He says that *bapto*, "instead of literally denoting wetting in any manner, does not literally include wetting at all." In this position he is opposing the Greeks and not Dr. Gale. Dr. J. W. Dale quotes Plutarch as saying: "*Bapsai*, the poet has called, to wet or moisten." Suidas says: "Wetting (*bapsas*) the hollow of his hand he sprinkles the judgment seat." These two Greek writers understood *bapto*, as to its meaning, in a different sense from Dr. Carson.

We come now to the noted passage in Dan. iv. 30, Septuagint: "His body was wet from the dew of heaven." This text states unequivocally that the body of Nebuchadnezzar was wet, and it is as plainly stated that that wetting was *ebaphe*, the Greek word now under discussion. His body (*ebaphe*) was wet. This case has always been a difficult one for immersionist

writers to handle. As it stands in the Septuagint, it is fatal to their theory, but as to what disposition to make of it they know not. Common people say that the dew fell upon the body of Nebuchadnezzar and made it wet. Dr. Cox, of London, says: "It does not imply the manner in which the effect was produced, but the effect itself; not the mode by which the body of the king was wetted, but the condition, as resulting from exposure to the dew of heaven." In reply to Dr. Cox, Dr. Carson says: "This gives up the point at issue, as far as mode is concerned. This in fact makes *bapto* signify simply to wet, without reference to mode." So Dr. Carson repudiates Dr. Cox's position on the question. Then Dr. Gale becomes eloquent over the case. He says "the dews in the East are generally very large;" he then goes to Gideon's fleece for a "bowl full of water;" then to the "dew of Hermon;" then to the "dew that descended upon the mountains of Zion;" then to "her majesty's leeward islands in America," where everything "would be burnt up were it not for the dews which fall plentifully in the night;" then he finds Captain Halley making some experiments over in St. Helena where "the dews fall in such abundance as to make his paper too wet to write on;" then he takes a trip to Africa, where Pliny tells us "the nights were very dewy;" then he finally lands down in Egypt, where "they have little or no rain," but "they do have nocturnal dews." Well, what of all that? Why, to get dew enough for Nebuchadnezzar to "lie in dew, and be covered with it all over, as if he had been dipped."

After all this sounding of trumpets, no one knows any better than Dr. Gale that the body of Nebuchadnezzar had simply "a moderate, gentle wetting" by the

dew falling upon it. When he wrote this he must have been in the same state of mind he was when he dipped a lake in the blood of a mouse. After he had performed that wonderful operation, and had come to himself, he says: "For indeed what can be more ridiculous than for a man seriously to talk of dipping a lake or river in blood" (p. 69)? I very cordially agree with Dr. Gale in this.

But Dr. Carson is by no means satisfied with Dr. Gale's disposition of the case. He says, on page 36, that "Dr. Gale absurdly supposes that *bapto* means to cover with water without reference to mode, and at the same time metaphorically alludes to dipping." Then he says: "But Daniel does not say that Nebuchadnezzar should lie in dew, and be covered with it all over;" and "neither Daniel nor his translators say that Nebuchadnezzar should be as wet as if he had been dipped." He thus summarily disposes of Dr. Gale's theory. In his opinion it is simply absurd. Then he says: "If we would fairly meet this passage, we must not merely show that Nebuchadnezzar was completely wetted, but that a wetting in one mode may be figuratively designated by the words that properly denote a wetting in another mode." That is an admission that the body of the king was made wet by the dew falling upon it; that is the "one mode" by which it was done. But what does Dr. Carson say he will do? Why he says that he will use words that denote "a wetting in another mode," and call them *figurative*. Now here are his words: "The words of the Septuagint are, 'His body was immersed in the dew.'" Now certainly no scholar, except Dr. Carson, would even pretend that that is a correct rendering of the Greek. He translates

apo, in, a meaning that it never has. Then he translates *ebaphe*, immersed, a meaning that it never has. Now these are his figurative words, which are to take the meaning out of the literal words in the case, and substitute the meaning of words entirely different, and call them figurative. Any one can see why he seeks to pervert the plain meaning of the text. It is fatal to his theory.

Dr. Gale says: "To deduce a sense from words which was not intended, is very difficult, and requires artifice and violence, whereas the genuine meaning wants no such labor, but is natural and easy" (p. 60). He and Dr. Carson both knew that fact by experience. Dr. Gale "dipped a lake in the blood of a mouse," and Dr. Carson immersed the body of the king by the dew falling upon it. The interpretation which we give is both "natural and easy." The literal reading is: "*His body was wet from the dew of heaven*" Dr. Carson is bent on sustaining a theory even at the expense of common sense and the plain meaning of this text. Let the Bible speak on this subject. In 2 Sam. xvii. 12, we read: "And we will light upon him as the dew falleth on the ground;" and in Deut. xxxii. 2, it is said: "My speech shall distill as the dew." To distill "is to fall gently upon," just as the dew falleth. Then in Num. xi. 9, we find this language: "And when the dew fell upon the camp in the night, then manna fell upon it." The manner in which the dew falls upon the ground, and also the manner in which it fell upon the body of Nebuchadnezzar, is settled by God's eternal truth; and all of Dr. Carson's withering sarcasm, and his resort to figurative language, and his call upon hyperbole, never changes it in the least. Dr. Carson

has said that *bapto* never signifies to wet in any manner, but now he is completely upset. No one would ever have thought of giving such distorted interpretations of this text, if it had not been that the immersion theory required it. We come naturally to the following conclusions:

1. That *bapto* is not a word of one meaning. It is a generic term, and not specific. There is no word in English that can define it. Dr. Gale made a heroic effort to do this but failed. Dr. Carson even pronounced his effort absurd. He gives some examples from which he says: "It could not be known that *bapto* ever signifies to dip."

2. *Bapto* settles nothing as to the mode of Christian baptism, for it is never used with reference to that ordinance. Although Dr. Gale says that *bapto*, and *baptizo* are synonymous, as to meaning, yet facts show that that is an error. *Bapto* takes dip as one of its meanings, but *baptizo* never does; and *baptizo* takes immerse as one of its meanings, but *bapto* never does. Those who practice dipping for baptism call it immersion, but it is not so in fact. This truth will be developed further on.

3. *Bapto* should be ruled out of the discussion on the mode of baptism. It proves nothing in favor of the Baptist cause, nor does it prove anything against the pedo-Baptist cause. The immersionist repudiates it in theory, but he holds to it in practice.

BAPTIZO.

This is a Greek word and is as old as the Greek language. What does it mean? This has been the inquiry of thousands of people. It appears to me that most writers on the subject have endeavored to make it sustain a previously adopted theory, rather than to ascertain its true meaning by letting it speak for itself. A great many writers start out with the expressed declaration that it is a word of one meaning and easily translated. I have never read after one yet that did not drop that one meaning, in the first pages of his book, and substitute another meaning, and then another, until he was burdened with meanings. It is a matter of the utmost importance to have before our minds the exact point in debate. Those who claim for the word one meaning only, say it is a specific term. Those who dissent from that position, say it is a generic term, having more meanings than one. Baptist writers without an exception, so far as I know, take the position that it is a specific term, and also that it is a specific act. Dr. Gale says: "We cannot believe that it is so doubtful in Scripture as many pretend, whether dipping only be baptism." The specific act is dipping, according to Gale. Booth, of London, says: "The verb baptize in this controversy denotes an action required by the divine law." Then again: "*Baptizo* is a specific term." Cox, of London, says: "The idea of dipping is in every instance conveyed." Then

strangely he adds: "A person may indeed be immersed by pouring, but immersion is the being plunged into water, or overwhelmed by it." We have here a confusion of terms that is not very specific. First, the specific act "of dipping," and, secondly, a person "immersed by pouring;" and, thirdly, "immersion is the being plunged into water;" and, fourthly, it is the being "overwhelmed by it." Dr. Cox's idea of one meaning is very much confused. Dr. Morell, of Edinburg, says: "I believe that the word does mean to dip, and this is its most usual meaning." He holds to a specific meaning, "to dip." To this he adds: "But it appears quite evident that the word also bears the sense of covering by super-fusion." This is admitted by Dr. Cox. Thus far we surrender the question of immersion in company with Dr. Cox. "Super-fusion" literally means, flowing from above. So Dr. Cox and Dr. Morell both admit that one meaning of the word is pouring, provided the pouring is continued long enough. Professor Jewett says: "*Baptizo*, in the whole history of the Greek language, has but one meaning. It signifies to dip (or immerse) and never has any other meaning." He is for "specific act." But why say that *baptizo* has but one meaning, and then give it two? "Dip" and "immerse" are not equivalents. Dr. Fuller says: "*Baptizo* to make one dip, that is, to immerse." Then again: "*Baptizo* signifies to immerse and has no other meaning." "Suppose," says he, "a man should lie in the baptistery while it is filling. The pouring of the water would not be the immersion, but an immersion would take place if he remained long enough." Now what becomes of the mode, and the word of one meaning? But he further says: "It is the effect of the

pouring" that constitutes the immersion. It seems that Dr. Fuller has a progressive theory. First, to dip, a specific act; then "to immerse, and has no other meaning;" then an immersion by pouring water into a baptistery, then "it is the effect." It is the effect, or the result of the pouring, that puts a man into a baptized condition. Dr. Conant says: "The Greek word (*baptizo*) expresses nothing more than *the act* of immersion." Then again: "The word *baptizein*, during the whole existence of the Greek as a spoken language, had a perfectly defined and unvarying import." It does seem that a word having been used for two thousand years, in the same language, with "unvarying import," ought to have an exact synonym in every spoken tongue on earth. Can Dr. Conant give us that word? He says: "*Baptizein* means to immerse, immerge, submerge, to dip, to plunge, to imbathe, to whelm." He gives seven defining terms and no two of them synonymous. He says: "Immerse is its true and only meaning." Then there is no place for the other six. In speaking of the Baptist revision of the New Testament, he says: "The word immerse has been selected, as *most nearly* resembling the original word in the extent of its application." He had just said that immerse was its "true and only meaning," but now he says the most that can be said of it is, that it *most nearly* resembles the original word. Now, according to Dr. Conant's own admission, he gives us a word that only resembles the "original." It is not a *fac simile*. Dr. Carson, in speaking of *baptizo*, says: "My position is, that it always signifies to dip; never expressing anything but mode." He also says: "I have all the lexicographers and commentators against me in this opinion." He

says: "It will be necessary to say a word or two with respect to the authority of lexicons." He then lays down a principle, which he thinks should govern all learned men, and says: "Now it is from ignorance of this principle that lexicographers have given meanings to words which they do not possess." The trouble is the meanings they give do not suit his theory. As to boldness in maintaining his position, Dr. Carson never had a predecessor, nor has he ever had a successor. He treats an opponent with the utmost disrespect. He says of some of them that were it not for the positions they occupy, their arguments would be unworthy of notice, and they are "strong only from ignorance." He says: "I would gainsay an angel from heaven who should say this commission may extend to the baptism of any but believers" (Carson on Baptism, p. 253). "Mr. Hall, of America," calls his attention to Mark vii. 4: "And when they come from the market, except they wash (baptize), they eat not." He replies as follows: "Either the persons referred to were immersed on the occasions mentioned, or the inspired writer testifies a falsehood" (Baptism, p. 397). It does seem to me to be very presumptuous in any mortal man to make the truth of God's word hinge upon his knowledge of a Greek word. A man being conscious of the truth of his theory, would never be under the necessity of making any such declaration. "Let God be true" (Rom. iii. 4).

Nearly all the writers here quoted, start out with "dip," a "specific act," as the meaning of *baptizo*. Dr. Conant says: "It is the act of immersion." They all agree that is an act. According to all of these authorities, *baptizo* has its full meaning in the act performed,

and not in the result of that act. We will see as we proceed how they shift from "act" to "result," and from "result" to "condition." The idea seems to be conveyed, by all of these writers that dip, immerse, and plunge all mean the same thing, but such is not the case. An object dipped into water or other liquids is taken out immediately, or otherwise it is not a dip. When an object is immersed in water, or any other liquid, it remains in that immersed condition forever, so far as *baptizo* is concerned. Dr. Carson says (Mode of Baptism, p. 103): "Now, as far as depends on what is actually expressed by the word, I grant that this is the case." One writer upon this subject says: That in the immersion of a candidate for baptism, the act performed is actually that which is commanded in the commission to baptize. Immerse, of itself, never takes an object out of the water. Dr. Dale, quotes from one of his critics (*The National Baptist*), as saying that "He" (Dale) "has, also, brought clearly out what our own examination had before proved, that the word *baptizo* does not of itself involve the lifting out from the fluid of that which is put in. In other words, that it is in this respect exactly equivalent to the English word *immerse*." Another one of Dr. Dale's critics says: "He did not command to put people into the water and take them out again, but to put them under the water." Then the same writer says: "Christian baptism is no mere literal and senseless dipping." And yet that is exactly what the immersionist baptizer does. He dips the subject into the water, and then lifts him out as quick as possible. *Bapto* is sometimes used in that sense, but *baptizo* never does. This same writer says that "*baptizo* never does engage to take its subject out

of the water." But he says: "We . . . can trust to men's instinctive love of life, their common sense, their power of volition and normal muscular action, to bring them safely out." In other words, they make *bapto* do for them that which *baptizo* will not do. And yet *bapto* is never used in the Greek Testament in speaking of Christian baptism. Now take the statements of these Baptist writers, and the sum of it is, that this "senseless dipping," as one of them calls it, is not Christian baptism at all. It comes under the head of *bapto*, and *not baptizo*. We have heretofore seen that all Baptist writers on the subject of baptism, commit themselves to the theory of one single act, as the meaning of *baptizo*, and that act is "to dip." Dr. Gale says: "*Bapto* and *baptizo* signify nothing else but to dip" (Reflections on Mr. Wall's History of Infant Baptism, p. 72). Dr. Carson says: "My position is that it always signifies to dip; never expressing anything but mode" (Carson on Baptism, p. 55). Then he says: "I have all the lexicographers and commentators against me in this opinion." Dr. Gale was selected by his friends as the most suitable man of the Baptist Church in England to reply to Dr. Wall's work on baptism. Dr. Gale commenced his book with the declaration that *baptizo* means "to dip," and "all other meanings necessarily excluded." But in this book Dr. Gale says: "There are other passages, . . . where, though indeed the word is used, it appears by other circumstances that the writer could not mean *dip* by it" (Reflections, etc., p. 68). How is that? *Baptizo* means nothing but "dip," and all other meanings *necessarily* excluded, and yet "other passages," . . . where "the writer could not mean dip." It always means "dip," and yet it does

not always mean "dip." Well, well! But he finds another case that is very difficult to manage, as will appear from the following language: "Besides, the word *baptizo*, perhaps, does not so necessarily express the action of putting under water, as in general a thing's being in that condition, no matter how it comes so, whether it is put into the water, or the water comes over it." In this case he gives up the "dip," that excluded all other meanings, and admits that an object may be baptized by the water coming over it. So, Dr. Gale, with his theory of specific act, and that act "to dip," is stranded before he has written one hundred pages.

Dr. Carson starts out with a bolder front than Dr. Gale did. He says of *bapto* and *baptizo*: "As to totality of immersion, the one is perfectly equivalent to the other" (Carson on Baptism, p. 23). So *baptizo* expresses a total immersion. Then again he says: "I can do miracles about the water; I will make the word find it for me, even in the deserts of Arabia" (Carson on Baptism, p. 370). He says there is "no evidence but the word necessary in any instance" (Carson on Baptism, p. 374). But after making many turns, and using many figures and hyperboles, in order to get over difficulties, he meets a Mr. Hall, of America, who is pressing him with examples that he cannot answer, and who is driving him to the wall, and he finally cries out, in very agony of soul, "Must I tell you again and again, Mr. H., that we never pretend to prove the extent of the immersion from the word itself?" Then he says: "We can prove a total immersion; but we are not to prove it from the word itself." (Carson on Baptism, p. 403.) And yet he started out with the declaration that the

word *baptizo* means dip, and nothing but dip, throughout all Greek literature; and then that it means a total immersion; and nothing is needed but the testimony of the word in any instance; but now, under the pressure brought to bear by Mr. Hall, it fails, and if total immersion is proven at all, it must be by other circumstances, and not by the word itself. But suppose the circumstances do not exist. We will take one example. Gregory, of Nazianzen, who was a Greek, said that he knew a man who baptized his bed with his tears. Now what circumstances in that case are there that can prove an immersion, either total or partial? The facts upon the very face of this case show that there was no immersion in any sense whatever. Baptist writers, in attempting to define *baptizo*, say that it is a specific term, a word of one meaning, a definite act, and that act "to dip." No Greek lexicon, however, defines it as a word of one meaning. Baptist writers themselves do not adhere to this rule by any means. Dr. Carson before he had written four pages on "The Mode of Baptism," uses three words as definitions of *baptizo*. He says: "Baptism means to lay under water." "To lay," is not a word of mode at all, nor does it express any action. The object is simply "lying still." Dr. Carson had found in the writings of "Aristotle, a famous Grecian philosopher, who flourished nearly five hundred years before the Christian era," "Certain desert places full of rush and seaweed; which when it is ebb tide are not baptized (*baptizesthai*); but when it is full tide are flooded." Dr. Carson finds the word *baptizesthai*, and he cannot say that the seacoast was taken up and dipped into the water, because it is lying still, and the water comes over it; but now, according to

his theory, Christian baptism must be like this case, because he finds *baptizo*. Therefore, "baptism means to lay under water." But we have not reached the full measure of this case yet. Dr. Carson must locate his subject (lay him down), and then cause the water to flow in upon him. This is the first case that Dr. Carson takes up, after he commences his discussion of the mode of baptism, and his word "dip," "through all Greek literature," vanishes out of sight. This old Grecian philosopher had no more respect for it than the ox had for the gnat on his horn. In reference to this same case, Dr. Carson makes the following statement: "Now though the water comes over the land, and there is no actual exemplification of the mode expressed by this word, yet it still expresses that mode" (Carson on Baptism, p. 21). It does not do a thing, and yet it does that very thing. We have now seen Dr. Carson struggling with his first case. He is a little disposed, however, to raise a question with the old Grecian philosopher himself before he gives it up. He says: "The thing here *supposed* to be baptized." But he must settle that question with Aristotle. The old Grecian says it was a baptism.

I propose now giving a few examples from classic Greek writers, showing how they use *baptizo*. For the Greek of these cases I am indebted to Dr. J. W. Dale's *Classic Baptism*.

The first one is on page 283.

"When midnight had baptized (*ebaptizon*) the city by sleep." This Greek writer means the people living in the city. They are baptized by sleep. The condition of the people is changed from that of wakefulness to sleep. They are literally asleep. There is no figure or

hyperbole in the case. Dr. Conant says that "midnight had plunged the city in sleep." His fertile imagination constructs a vast pool of water, and then by hyperbole, or by catachresis, or some other big word, that Baptist writers are in the habit of using, he takes up the city and plunges it into the water. This is about equal to one of Dr. Gale's exploits when he dipped a lake into the blood of a mouse. It is just wonderful what can be done by figures of speech when truth and facts fail. The quotation now under consideration is from Heliodorus, a classic Greek writer. In his use and understanding of *baptizo*, it never was necessary to put language to the rack, as some of his interpreters do. Latin classic writers may throw light on the writings of Greek writers. Ovid says: "Before the doors of the dwellings of the God Somnus rich poppies grow, and countless herbs, from the juice of which humid night gathers soporifics, and sprinkles (*spargit*) them over the darkened earth." Somnus was the god of sleep, and instead of plunging the city into a great pool of water, he sprinkles the eyelids of the people with soporifics. Virgil says: "Venus diffuses (*irrigat*) gentle sleep through the limbs of Ascanius." Virgil and Ovid never dreamed of a city being plunged into sleep in their day. Webster says: Plunge is, "The act of throwing or pitching one's self headlong," which certainly is very little like sleep. "Venus diffuses gentle sleep." Plunging, instead of putting one to sleep, would keep him awake. Dr. Conant's interpretation is exactly the opposite of the classic idea; and yet he claims the classics. Other cases of baptism by sleep could be given, but one is sufficient. No plunging, no dipping, no immersion, and yet a baptism. On page 320, we have a case of

baptism, "by much wine." "Having baptized (*baptisza*) and put to sleep Alexander by much wine." Dr. Carson renders this case thus: "Having immersed Alexander in wine." The Greek is, *Oino de pollo*: Much wine. Why did he leave out "much?" If Dr. Carson's rendering is correct there must have been much wine, at least a bathing-tub full. The truth of the matter is, that Alexander drank the wine that baptized him. Dr. Carson knew this as well as I do, and yet he says that he was "immersed in wine." The wine was in him. Dr. Carson's rendering shows the intenseness of theory. It is a burlesque upon common sense. He must have felt it so, for he then says: "That is, having made him drunk with wine." Immersion in wine and drunk with wine, are two very different things. They cannot both be true. Dr. Carson started out with the statement that *baptizo* signified a specific act, and that act was "dip through all Greek literature." We have in the case now under consideration, a man baptized by drinking much wine. Dr. Gale says that *baptizo* means dip, and "nothing else but dip." Now how will he and Dr. Carson get a dip out of this example? The man was not dipped into the wine, nor was he plunged into the wine, neither was he immersed into the wine, but he was baptized by much wine. What will their theory do with this baptism? Well, Dr. Carson says, when a drunk man is said to be baptized, "it is to be taken figuratively." We have now the drunk man. He is literally drunk. There is no figure in that, unless he makes one of himself in the mud. Webster says: A figure is "that which is formed in resemblance of something else." Now does this drunk man resemble Christian baptism

(immersion)? I meet an immersionist on one of the streets of our county town, and near by is a drunk man, down in the gutter, and I say to my immersionist friend, That man down in the gutter is a figure of your baptism. The man would feel that he was insulted, and yet that is exactly what Dr. Carson says. The Greek idea is, not that we are to find in the word *baptizo* the mode or manner in which the man became drunk (baptized), but his changed condition from soberness to drunkenness. Greek writers speak of men baptized by an opiate drug. They speak also of all Asia being baptized by the result of one battle.

On page 317 is an example in which Plato speaks of a youth who was baptized (*baptizomenon*) "by a series of subtle questions addressed to him" by "some sophists." The young man became embarrassed and confused by these experts in sophistry, and Plato says he was baptized. The young man was mentally embarrassed, and that is what Plato calls baptism. This case can neither be dipped nor immersed. I suppose that the best that Dr. Carson can do with this example, is to say of Plato, as he did of another old Greek writer, that he does not use figures very correctly. But Dr. Gale expresses the opinion "that words or sentences are probably never to be understood, but in their literal sense." That which is of so much help to Dr. Carson, Dr. Gale repudiates.

On the same page in *Classic Baptism* is an example from Plutarch. He says: "Why do they pour in beside the wine sea-water, and say that fishermen received an oracle commanding them to baptize (*baptizein*) Bacchus by the sea?" In this case we have a baptism in which the mode is definitely and specifically stated. It

is by pouring. Bacchus is the god of wine, and is used in this case to personate wine. The command is to baptize wine. This is done by pouring sea-water into the wine. All this is manifest upon the very face of the statement made by this old Greek, and never would be called in question were it not for the fact that it completely demolishes the theory of "dip and nothing but dip through all Greek literature." But Dr. Conant says that "to immerse Bacchus is nothing else than to temper wine." Then he says this was done "in the sea." Then he puts in parenthesis (or at) the sea. The Greek is, *pros ten thalattan*, near the sea. Dr. Conant, it seems, at the sacrifice of common sense and truth, is determined to make this Greek writer say what his language does not imply by any means. Plutarch says: They pour sea-water into the wine, by the sea. Dr. Conant says: To immerse Bacchus (wine) in (or at) the sea. This is a baptism performed by pouring, and Dr. Conant's efforts to evade its force, only show the weakness of his cause. It is impossible to immerse wine by pouring water into it. Its intoxicating qualities can be taken away and it becomes unintoxicating, and that is why Plutarch says it was baptized; but there was no immersion, dipping nor plunging, and yet there was a baptism by pouring.

We have now examined a few examples taken from the classics, and not one of them sustains the theory of dip, immerse, or plunge. We could examine many more with the same results. We want the point in controversy to be kept clearly before the mind of the reader. Our position is, that *baptizo* is a generic term, having more meanings than one, and that from the word itself, no one can tell the mode of the baptism.

Baptizo makes demand for condition, and not mode. Dr. Gale says: "*Baptizo* signifies nothing else but to dip." Dr. Carson says: "My position is that it always signifies to dip; never expressing anything but mode." These two writers are very definite in stating their positions. Their statements bind them to show that *baptizo*, in every case where it is used by Greek writers, means to dip. If they fail in one case they lose their cause. If we show a number of examples in which *baptizo* does not mean dip or immerse, our cause is established. If they show that *baptizo*, in some instances, means immerse, that does not affect our position in the least. In the Memoir of Dr. Carson, we find this language: "We frankly confess that the more we read on the baptismal controversy, the more our charity compels us to struggle against the conviction which forces itself upon us, that on this subject it is not light that is most wanted, *but religious honesty*." That is to say, we have the light, if we had the "religious honesty." Well, we promise this much, if Greeks speak the truth, we will make an exhibit of both light and honesty.

We will now examine *baptizo* as used in hellenistic Greek, that is, Greek intermingled with Hebraisms. We have seen that our position is amply sustained by classic Greek. The first example is from Jewish Antiquities. "Those, therefore, defiled by a dead body, introducing a little of the ashes and hyssop-branch into a spring, and baptizing of this ashes (introduced) into the spring, they sprinkled both on the third and seventh of the days." This gives the process for the cleansing of a person ceremonially unclean. The law for such cases is found in the nineteenth chapter of Numbers. The baptizing of such an one with ashes and spring water

was by sprinkling. That Josephus understood the import of *baptizo*, and the nature of baptism, there is no question. Paul says (Heb. ix. 13): "The ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh." The person is changed from being ceremonially unclean to ceremonial purity. Moses says the man that is unclean, and will not purify himself, "that soul shall be cut off from the congregation, because . . . the water of separation hath not been sprinkled upon him." We have in this example from Josephus, a clearly defined baptism, and the mode of this baptism is as clearly defined to be by sprinkling. This case is so plain that its force must be felt, even by the most rigid immersionist. Dr. Gale says *baptizo* signifies nothing else but dip, and all other meanings are excluded. Well, now we have a case from which dip is excluded. Josephus was a Jew, born at Jerusalem, thirty-seven years after Christ. He wrote a history of the Jewish war, both in the Hebrew and Greek languages. His competency as a witness to bear testimony as to the meaning of *baptizo*, will stand in any court.

BAPTISM OF WATER BY THE HOLY SPIRIT.

"And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters" (Gen. i. 2). Upon this text Tertullian, in his Treatise on Baptism, has this to say: "But it will suffice to have thus called at the outset those points in which withal is recognized that primary principle of baptism, which was even then fore-noted by the very attitude assumed for a type of baptism, that the Spirit of God, who hovered over (the waters) from the beginning would continue to linger over the waters of

the baptized." . . . "Thus the nature of the waters, sanctified by the Holy One itself conceived withal the power of sanctifying" (Ante-Nicene Fathers, vol. iii., p. 670). I quote from Tertullian, not for his theology, but for his knowledge of language. Tertullian was born about A.D. 145. He was born a heathen, and became a Christian about A.D. 185. He was one of the Latin fathers, and a very learned man. He saw in this verse the "primary principle of baptism," and it was even then "a type of baptism." The primary principle of baptism with the patristic fathers of the church, was not the mode, but the nature of baptism. It was the change effected by baptism. In the baptism now under consideration there are but two elements involved—the Holy Spirit and water. He says the Spirit of God hovered over the waters. The Bible language is, "The Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." Then he says thus were the "nature of the waters sanctified by the Holy One." And the waters thus sanctified "conceived withal the power of sanctifying." The nature of the waters was changed from an unsanctified condition to a sanctified condition, and this change was the baptism. The doctrine of the patristic fathers was, that the water itself had to be baptized with the Holy Spirit before it had power to baptize. They taught that the form of baptism with mere water was no baptism at all. We have in this case a baptism, and no dipping. The water itself was baptized by the Holy Spirit. Dr. Gale says: *Baptizo* means dip, and all other meanings are excluded, but Dr. Tertullian gives us a case from which dip is forever banished. It is impossible to take up the waters from "the face of the deep" and dip them into the

Holy Spirit; but Dr. Gale did say: "The literal sense is, 'The lake was dipped in blood.'" Then again he did say, after writing six pages more in the same book, "For indeed what can be more ridiculous, than for a man seriously to talk of dipping a lake or river in blood." I agree with him in that. Tertullian, in the latter part of his life, was an immersionist, but not of the Gale sort.

THE BAPTISM OF WATER BY WOOD BEING CAST INTO IT.

When the children of Israel, under the leadership of Moses, went three days' journey into the wilderness of Shur, they came to Marah, but could not drink of the waters because they were bitter, then the Lord showed Moses a tree which when he had cast into the waters they were made sweet. Ambrose, one of the old Latin fathers, says: "There is another kind of baptism, . . . Moses cast the wood into the fountain and the water which before was bitter grew sweet" (*Judaic Baptism*, p. 144). This is a genuine baptism. It is a literal historical fact, that Moses did cast the wood into the waters, and the waters that were bitter became sweet. Their quality was changed. It is also a fact that Ambrose calls this a baptism. It is a literal baptism, and cannot be frittered away by figure, hyperbole, catachresis, or some other, as it were, or in such a manner, used to pervert the meaning of plain English. It was not the wood that was baptized, but the wood baptized the water. When the wood was cast into the water if there had been no change effected in the quality of the water, then, according to the teaching of Ambrose, there would have been no baptism. He

further says: "The bitterness of the fountain of Marah being attempered by the grace of the wood, we know that they were made pure." "Was not the water made sweet with wood, that the virtue thereof might be known" (Sirach. xxxviii. 5)? This case of baptism, by Ambrose, is clear proof that *baptizo* demands condition, and not mode.

WATER ITSELF BAPTIZED, JOHN V. 4.

"For an angel went down at a certain season into the pool and troubled the water."

Ambrose says of this transaction: "You have a fourth kind of baptism in the pool, when the water was troubled" (Judaic Baptism, p. 164).

This fourth kind of baptism was confined absolutely to the time when the water was troubled. Ambrose saw in this troubling of the water the very essence of baptism—changed condition. As to its power of effecting a mere dipping, that which Dr. Gale says only is baptism, it could do that at any time. The troubling of the water added nothing to it but the healing power. Whosoever first, after the troubling of the water, stepped in (*embas*) was made whole. There was no immersion, nor dipping. The man who was before diseased is now made whole—his condition thoroughly changed. The troubled water in effecting this baptism was the efficient agency, and not merely the receiving element. If the diseased man had "stepped in" at any other time there would have been no baptism. If Tertullian, Ambrose, and other writers of their day, were correct in their understanding of their own languages, then Dr. Carson and Dr. Gale, with their theory of dip, and all other meanings excluded, were entirely wrong. There is an impassable gulf between them.

BAPTISM BY SPRINKLING.

I will give two quotations from Ambrose on this point:

"He who wished to be cleansed by typical baptism was sprinkled with the blood of the lamb by a bunch of hyssop." Then he says in another place: "He who is baptized, whether in conformity with the law, or in conformity with the gospel, is cleansed; in conformity with the law, because Moses sprinkled the blood of the lamb with a bunch of hyssop" (Judaic Baptism, p. 188.).

These are quotations from Ambrose, one of the Latin fathers. The Latin was their vernacular tongue, but they also wrote and spoke the Greek language.

In the first quotation, Ambrose states unequivocally that typical baptism was effected by sprinkling. Typical the ox had for the gnat on his horn. In reference to baptism, or the ante-type baptism, must be like the type. In printing you set the type for the capital letter A, and when the impress is made you have the ante-type, which is the capital letter A. That is all you have, and you could not possibly get anything else. When Ambrose says that the mode of the type baptism was sprinkling, that settles the mode of the ante-type baptism.

In the next quotation Ambrose puts baptism according to the law and baptism according to the gospel, upon an exact equality as baptisms. He says: "He who is baptized in conformity with the law . . . Moses sprinkled." Then it follows, as a matter of fact, that, "he who is baptized in conformity with the gospel," must be sprinkled. Now if language can settle anything, it is settled from what Ambrose says, that baptism was performed by sprinkling.

Cyril, one of the Greek fathers of the church, in addressing candidates for baptism, says: "Rejoice, O heavens, and be glad, O earth, because of those who are about to be sprinkled with hyssop, and to be purified by the spiritual hyssop" (Judaic Baptism, p. 188).

Now whatever may have been the practice of Cyril, on other occasions, it is very manifest that he taught the candidates for baptism on this occasion, that they could be baptized by sprinkling. His understanding of the meaning of *baptizo* is as far removed from Dr. Carson's theory as the East is from the West.

CIRCUMCISION IS CALLED BAPTISM.

Joshua v. 3: "And Joshua made sharp knives, and circumcised the children of Israel."

In commenting upon this text Justin Martyr says: "What, then, is the word of circumcision to me, having received testimony from God? What need is there of that baptism (circumcision) to one baptized by the Holy Spirit?" Justin Martyr was a Grecian philosopher, born about A.D. 114. He wrote the language of Homer and Plato. It must be admitted that he understood it. He calls circumcision a baptism, without a word of explanation. Dr. Carson (p. 490) says that Justin Martyr "speaks of circumcision as a baptism, or agreeing in the emblem." Now, "or agreeing in the emblem," is an addition to Justin Martyr's language, made by Dr. Carson, without any authority whatever. Justin never said that, but what he did say was fatal to Dr. Carson's theory, consequently he must correct the old Grecian sage. Justin said that circumcision was a baptism, and it must remain so, until Justin himself makes the correction.

BAPTISM BY POURING AND SPRINKLING.

"Jerome, one of the most learned and productive authors of the early Latin church, was born about A.D. 331; . . . was educated with care in literary studies, and made familiar with Roman and Greek classics." Such an one can speak with authority. He says: "And I will pour out or sprinkle (*et effundam sive aspergam*) upon you clean water, . . . so that upon the believing and those converted, I will pour out the clean water of saving baptism." Now Jerome, without the least hesitation, or without one word of explanation, says that the clean water of saving baptism can be communicated by pouring or sprinkling. Here is baptism as clear as daylight, and no dipping, and no immersion.

Cyril, of Jerusalem, born A.D. 315, says: "Thou seest the power of baptism (*baptismatos*). Be of good courage, O Jerusalem, the Lord will take away all thy iniquities. . . . He will sprinkle upon you clean water and ye shall be purified from all your sin." Cyril calls attention to the power of baptism, and that that power is developed through sprinkling clean water.

Cyprian, born A.D. 200, says: "But it is necessary that the water be first purified and sanctified by the priest, that it may be able by its own baptism (*baptismati*) to wipe off the sins of the baptized (*baptizomenon*) man. And through Ezekiel, the prophet, the Lord says: 'And I will sprinkle you with pure water.'" Then in another place he refers to Ezek. xxxvi. 25, and says: "Whence it appears that the sprinkling of water, also, like the saving washing, obtains divine grace." In this first quotation, Cyprian teaches, as all the early Christian fathers taught, if they mentioned the subject at

all, that mere water could not effect a baptism. They say the Gentiles baptize, but that is no baptism, because it has no power to take away sins. Their doctrine is that the water itself must first be filled with the Holy Spirit, and then it can baptize. But we are only concerned as to their use of language.

BAPTISM BY TEARS.

The first writer from whom I will quote upon this subject is Clemens, of Alexandria. He was born about A.D. 153 in the city of Alexandria. He was a man of great learning. Jerome pronounces him "the most learned of all the ancients." Cyril, of Alexandria, calls him "a man admirably learned and skillful, and one that searched to the depths all the learning of the Greeks with an exactness rarely attained before." Theodoret says: "He surpassed all others, and was a holy man." A. Cleveland Coxe, D.D., says of him: "After Justin and Ireneus, he is to be reckoned the founder of Christian literature." Dr. Coxe also says that in the time of Clemens "the universal language of Christians is Greek."

Now the question is, Were the Greeks of that day competent exponents of their own language? or was that rare gift reserved for the immersionists of the present day? Dr. Carson speaks with a positiveness that surpasses any Greek. He claims that he is correct, "or the inspired writer testifies a falsehood" (p. 397). Clemens wrote a treatise on "Who is the rich man that shall be saved" (*Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. ii., p. 603)? In that he says: Listen to a narrative of the Apostle John. For on the tyrant's death he returned to Ephesus from the Isle of Patmos. He was soon called to Smyrna

on some church business, and there met a youth of "comely appearance," and committed him to the care of the bishop (pastor), and then set out for Ephesus. The bishop at Smyrna instructed the young man, "and finally baptized him." "After this he relaxed his stricter care," and the young man went back to the world. "Time passed, and some necessity having emerged, they send again for John." When he had settled other matters, he called on the bishop for the youth. The bishop told John that "he had turned wicked and abandoned, and at last a robber." John having learned his whereabouts, and securing a horse and a guide, started to the place, and on his approach the young man turned, ashamed, and was about to flee away, but John called to him; "when he heard, he first stood, looking down, then threw down his arms, then trembled and wept bitterly." "And on the old man approaching, he embraced him, speaking for himself with lamentations as he could, and he was baptized (*baptizomenos*) a second time with tears." Clemens says his second baptism was "with tears." The mode of this baptism was the dropping of tears from his eyes. The record is that he "trembled and wept bitterly." It also says he "stood, . . . and on the old man approaching, he embraced him." This was not a baptism by figure, nor by hyperbole, nor by catachresis (words of refuge for Dr. Carson when hard pressed), but a plain literal baptism by the young man's own tears. How was his first baptism administered? Was that by immersion? Clemens does not say that this was his second immersion, but his second baptism; and the mode of it is as far removed from immersion as the East is from the West. He was baptized the first time

immediately after John's return from the Isle of Patmos, which was A.D. 96. It was more than one hundred years after this, before the first case of immersion was ever put upon record in church history. Tertullian, one of the Latin fathers of the church, was born about A.D. 145, and Jerome says he flourished as a writer from A.D. 193, to A.D. 216. About this time he left the true church and "adopted the opinions of Montanus." Montanus claimed to be inspired, denied the doctrine of the Trinity, and taught many other false theories in regard to Christianity. Tertullian, in speaking of baptism, and making many ceremonial additions to it, says: "Hereupon we are thrice immersed, making a somewhat ampler pledge than the Lord has appointed in the gospel" (*Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. iii., p. 94). This is the first record of immersion "that the world knows anything about." The young man that was brought into the church and baptized, by the direction of John the apostle, was baptized more than a hundred years before Tertullian flourished as a writer. Tertullian's trine immersion will come up again for examination.

Eusebius, of Cesarea, who wrote a history of the Christian church from the birth of Christ to the year A.D. 324, says of this same young man, that he was "baptized a second time with his own tears" (*Eusebius, Eccle. His.*, p. 107). Eusebius, being a Greek, and writing in the Greek language, confirms the statement of Clemens.

Athanasius, "one of the greatest men of whom the church can boast," says: "These baptisms, . . . I mean that of water, and again that by the witness of one's own blood, and thirdly, that by tears, in which also

the harlot was cleansed." Then the harlot was baptized by her own tears. She was not immersed, nor dipped, nor plunged, but she was baptized. Athanasius teaches that tears, in general, can effect a baptism.

Gregory, of Nazianzen, was educated at Athens, the very seat of Greek learning; and history says he was an accomplished Greek writer. In enumerating the different kinds of baptisms, he says: "And I know yet a fifth, the baptism of tears, washing nightly his bed with tears" (Judaic Baptism, p. 382).

This man baptized his bed nightly. Webster says "that means every night." Now for a man to shed tears enough every night to dip his bed into them is a literal impossibility. But the man baptized his bed every night with his tears. Dr. Carson has said if one case of baptism (immersion) by sprinkling could be found, he would give up the controversy. A number of such cases have been found.

BAPTISM BY POURING.

The first author from whom we quote upon this point is Origen. He was born at Alexandria A.D. 185. His father was a Christian, and died a martyr when Origen was seventeen years old. His father and mother were Greeks. It is said: "His own doting father imbued him with the literature of the Greeks." He was a pupil of Clemens, and afterward his successor in the "great Alexandrian school." That Origen understood Greek, and knew how to write it, is an admitted fact.

He makes reference to 1 Kings xviii. 33: "And he put the wood in order, and cut the bullock in pieces, and laid him on the wood, and said, Fill four barrels (pitchers) with water, and pour it on the burnt sacrifice

and on the wood." His language is: "But why do you believe that the Elias to come will baptize (*baptisein*) when he did not, in the time of Ahab, baptize (*baptisantos*) the victim upon the wood of the altar, which needed cleansing, at the appearing of the Lord by fire? For he commands the priests to do this."

Basil the Great, in speaking of this same transaction, says: "Elias has shown the power of baptism," and then he says: "The water is poured thrice upon the altar" (Judaic Baptism, pp. 328-9).

Origen, who was "imbued with the literature of the Greeks," says "the sacrifice and the wood" were baptized. And God's inspired word says the water was poured "on the burnt sacrifice and on the wood." I do not see how words can be put together to teach a case of baptism by pouring any more pointedly than we have in this example.

When Dr. Carson was brought face to face with this baptism, and saw the indisputable facts bristling at him, he said, in bewilderment, "Every child knows that our word immerse may be used in the same way" (p. 394). He makes his appeal to children again, because he must know that the statement upon the very face of it is an outrage to common sense.

Dr. Fuller says, as Origen lived two hundred years after the Savior's time, "I have not thought it worth while to examine this case."

It has been said that a defeated general has the right to select his own way of retreating. We will grant this to Dr. Fuller. He does stop, however, and looking back over his shoulder, says: Well "it was an immersion." The Bible says, it was a pouring, and Origen says it was a baptism. So we have the Bible

and Origen affirming, and Dr. Carson and Dr. Fuller denying.

It is in place to say something as to the quantity of water used in this baptism. Our translation says "twelve barrels." There is no evidence that these were "barrels" holding the quantity of water that we denominate a barrel. The best of scholars translate this "pitchers" of water. The Septuagint translates it by a Greek word which means "pitcher, urn, jar, or waterpot." These all indicate small vessels, and by no means a barrel holding thirty-six or forty gallons. The record is that "he made a trench about the altar, as great as would contain two measures of seed." "And the water ran round about the altar; and he filled the trench also with water." The Scripture measure of seed, according to Josephus, contained a very small fraction over two gallons and a half. So the trench would have held a little less than six gallons of water, and that was about the amount used. Ambrose, speaking of this same altar-baptism, says the water was cast over it from waterpots. I have never yet read after an immersionist writer on the mode of baptism, if he had time to examine this case at all, who did not have much to say about the "twelve barrels of water," and if that much did not immerse the altar it would *at least make it very wet*. But after all of the dodging, by Carson, and of the "I have not thought it worth while to examine this case" by Fuller, it stands as impregnable as the word of God against the theory of "dip and nothing but dip through all Greek literature."

The altar was not dipped, nor immersed, nor plunged; but it was baptized by twelve pitchers of water poured upon it.

The Hebrew word used in this case is *kad*, and Dr. Young, an eminent Hebrew scholar, renders it pitchers. The same word is used in Judges (vii. 20), where it is said that Gideon "and the three companies blew the trumpets and brake the pitchers." Then in Genesis (xxiv. 18) the word *kad* is used: "And she hasted, and let down her pitcher upon her hand, and gave him drink." It was a small vessel. Rebekah had gone "down to the well and filled her pitcher (*kad*) with water, and came up."

TERTULLIAN.

John xix. 34: "But one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side, and forthwith came there out blood and water." Tertullian, in referring to this text of Scripture, says: "These two baptisms he shed forth (*emisit*) from the wound of his pierced side" (Ante-Nicene Fathers, vol. iii., p. 677). Chrysostom, in speaking of the same transaction, says: "For the blood from his side dropped upon the earth, and purged away all its defilement." The water and the blood which dropped from the Savior's side while hanging upon the cross, are the two baptisms to which Tertullian refers. Tertullian was one of the Latin fathers, but it will not do to say that he did not know the meaning of *baptizo*. In the Introductory Note, to his works, it is said, that he "well understood the Greek language, and composed in it." *Emisit*, the Latin word he uses, is from *emitto*, and amongst other meanings it has, "to send forth, or out, or to drop." Then "*emittere lacrymas*," to shed tears. Now this is the word that Tertullian uses to explain the mode of the two baptisms. There is nothing under the shining sun that can help

the cause of "dip" in this case. There were two baptisms, one by blood and the other by water, and he is specific in stating that the blood and water "dropped" "from the wound of his pierced side." This is another example that Dr. Fuller "has not thought it worth while to examine."

BAPTISM BY BLOOD.

If immersion in water, or any other liquid, is essential to baptism, then every case of baptism by blood is an immersion, and this must be made out from the facts in the case. Dr. Fuller says: "*Baptizo* signifies to immerse and has no other meaning." Dr. Conant says: "The Greek word (*baptizo*) expresses nothing more than the act of immersion." The ground occupied by immersionists, without an exception, so far as I can learn, is clearly stated by these two eminent Baptist writers. *Baptizo* expresses *the act* of immersion. If I understand the meaning of the writer, it is the putting of the person to be baptized into the water, or other liquid, so as to cover him over.

John, of Damascus, says of John the Baptist, that he "was baptized . . . by his own blood" (*ebaptisthe to idio aimati*). This language is specific, "by his own blood."

Now if the writers just quoted are correct in their position, then John the Baptist was immersed into his own blood. The record is that Herod "sent and beheaded John in the prison" (Matt. xiv. 10). Now if John ever was immersed in his own blood this is the time it was done. He was literally beheaded, and his head was carried in a charger and given to the bloody-minded Herodias. Now who collected the blood into

a bathing tub, and put his head and body into it, the executioner, or his disciples? Dr. Gale sported with the blood of a mouse and dipped a lake into it. But Dr. Carson says of this: "What a monstrous paradox in rhetoric!" "Never was there such a figure." If it should be said that John was immersed in his own blood, that would be another "monstrous paradox in rhetoric." But it is said that he was baptized. Baptism is not immersion. To immerse John the Baptist in his own blood was a physical impossibility. This Greek writer simply means that John was *purified* "by his own blood." This is in exact keeping with Patristic writers on this subject. Origen says: "For it is the baptism of blood only, which makes us purer than the baptism of water made us" (Johannic Baptism, p. 226). Then speaking of the crucifixion of Christ, he says: "You see, therefore, that he called the shedding of his blood baptism." The shedding of his blood could, in no sense, be an immersion, or a dipping, or a covering over, but it was a baptism. Chrysostom says: "For the blood from his side dropped upon the earth and purged away all its defilement" (Judaic Baptism, p. 216). The dropping of his blood upon the earth as stated by Chrysostom, is the same as "the shedding of his blood," and this is exactly what Origen calls baptism. We have here a baptism and the mode of it put in such phraseology, by these two Greek writers, as to forever exclude every claim for an immersion, or dipping.

Cyril, of Jerusalem, says the Savior in redeeming the world, "shed forth water and blood; that some in times of peace might be baptized with water, and others in times of persecution, might be baptized with

their own blood." "For the Savior calls martyrdom baptism" (Johannic Baptism, p. 224). Basil Magnus says: "There are some who in striving for piety have undergone death for Christ, . . . being baptized by their own blood" (Johannic Baptism, p. 225).

Baptism, in these quotations, is used in the sense of purifying. If the Greeks understood Greek, then a man could be baptized by his own blood, and not immersed. John, of Damascus, says of John the Baptist, that he "was baptized by putting his hand upon the divine head of his Master." Our only business is to examine into the meaning of *baptizo*, as used by the Greeks. John, of Damascus, says, that John the Baptist "was baptized by putting his hand upon the divine head of his Master." The Greeks sometimes speak of baptism by the touch of the hand: "And putting his hand upon her he sealed her into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." "And many others were sealed with her."

Paul administered Christian baptism to certain persons who had previously been baptized by John's baptism, and then he "laid his hands upon them," that they might be baptized with the Holy Ghost. They were not immersed into the Holy Ghost. The record is that the "Holy Ghost came upon them." Hippolytus, a Greek writer, in speaking of the baptism of Christ, says: "He bowed his head to be baptized (*baptisthemai*) by John" (Johannic Baptism, p. 222). The point we make upon this quotation, is, that Hippolytus knew perfectly well that Christ, while standing upon his feet, could bow his head and receive baptism at the hands of John.

In these quotations we have three baptisms clearly

stated: 1. John was baptized by his own blood. 2. He was baptized by putting his hand upon the divine head of his Master. 3. Jesus bowed his head to be baptized by John.

BAPTISM OF REPENTANCE.

“John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins” (Mark i. 4). In this text of Scripture there are two baptisms clearly stated, and they are not the same. John was administering the rite of baptism. He says: “I . . . have baptized you with water.” It is not our purpose to discuss this part of the subject. It is said in the text he “preached the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins.” Dr. Carson’s emendation of the text is, he “preached repentance for the remission of sins.” The question may be asked, Why did he leave out baptism? The only answer that I can give is: That it was an unmanageable quantity, according to his theory. “The baptism of repentance,” is the text. Luke says (iii. 3): “He came . . . preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins.” This means that a baptism is effected by repentance, that is a changed condition of the man. We have in Matthew (xxi. 25) the same phraseology: “The baptism of John, whence was it?” It is John’s baptism. A baptism accomplished by John. John is the agent. Baptism of repentance. A baptism accomplished by repentance. Repentance is the agent. Here are two baptisms, one of John, and the other of repentance. It is just as clear that one of these baptisms is effected by repentance, as it is that the other is effected by John. In Luke vii. 29, it is said: “And all the people that heard him. . . justified

God, being baptized with the baptism of John." The baptism that John administered. There can be no question about this baptism. The baptism of repentance. This is not water-baptism. It is a baptism performed by repentance.

In Titus (iii. 5) we have similar language. "The washing of regeneration." In this the washing (cleansing) is effected by the regeneration and not the regeneration by the washing. The washing (cleansing) is the result of the regeneration. We have in this same text: "And renewing of the Holy Ghost." The renewing is the work of the Holy Ghost. This is beyond dispute. The Holy Ghost is the agent. "The renewing of the Holy Ghost." "The baptism of repentance." If this baptism is not the result of repentance, then we can determine nothing by the use of language. Repentance is a genuine baptism. Clement, of Alexandria, tells of a young man who "wept bitterly," "and was baptized a second time with his own tears." This old Greek writer sustains the Bible doctrine of the "baptism of repentance."

How Dr. Carson would dip a man into repentance I do not know. He says: *Baptizo* means dip, and nothing else but dip. Alexander Campbell gives the following rendering of the text: "Preaching the immersion *in water* of repentance *into* the remission of sins" (Quoted by Dr. Dale, *Johannic Baptism*, p. 256). Dr. Carson left out one word (*baptistma*) to make it suit his theory, and Mr. Campbell put in two words, not in the Greek, to make it conform to his theory. Dr. Carson had too much Greek, and Mr. Campbell did not have enough. This shows the intenseness of the immersion theory. One of them takes from the word of

the Lord, and the other one adds to it. It is evident that the case as it stands, in Greek, is very troublesome to both parties.

The Baptist translation of the New Testament has it: "And preaching the immersion of repentance for the remission of sins" (Mark i. 4). Now what is the immersion of repentance? I can easily understand the "baptism of repentance," but the "immersion of repentance" is quite another thing. Does repentance put the subject under water? It is something that repentance does. An object being immersed remains in that condition forever, so far as the word is concerned. Dr. Carson admits this. This translation has the peculiarity of being unintelligible. But now take the language as it is in the Greek and in the translation: "John preached the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." Genuine repentance effects a man's spiritual nature, so as to bring him into a changed condition toward God and his law, and that changed condition is the baptism. That true repentance does that very thing no one will question. Then the only point to be settled is, Was the inspired writer correct in calling that a baptism? That is the name he gives it: The baptism of repentance. The Greek fathers, such as Clement, of Alexandria, and Athanasius, patriarch of Alexandria, never hesitated for one moment to say of a man who "wept bitterly," that he was "baptized by his own tears." In this "baptism of repentance," there is no immersion, nor dipping, nor pouring, nor sprinkling, and yet it is a baptism. In *Classic Baptism*, p. 317, is a quotation saying that "Alexander was baptized by much wine." Alexander was not dipped, nor immersed into the wine, nor was

the wine poured or sprinkled upon him, but yet he was baptized. He drank the wine. In such baptisms there is no mode, except the drinking.

APOCRYPHA.

In the book Judith, twelfth chapter and seventh verse, it is written: "Then Holofernes commanded his guard that they should not stay her; thus she abode in the camp three days, and went out in the night into the valley of Bethulia and baptized (*ebaptizeto*) herself in the camp, at (*epi*) a fountain of water." This is spoken of Judith, a woman of Israel, who "feared God greatly." The Assyrian army in great numbers, were encamped near Bethulia, intending to make war upon Israel. Judith undertook by strategy to save her people and destroy the Assyrians. For this purpose she took her maid and went to the tent of Holofernes, who was the commander of the Assyrian army. Being a Jewess she kept up the rite of purification, and of prayer. She was permitted to go out in the night, with her maid and baptize (*purify*) herself at a fountain of water. This was done three nights in succession. The question is, How did she baptize herself? Dr. Carson decides very promptly that she immersed herself. He says: "I will make the word find her water" (p. 457). He is not very consistent with himself in disposing of this case. He first states that "it is evident that though she was in a camp, she was in such a part of it as to afford her the necessary seclusion" (p. 318). Then he asks the question, "Is it not evident, on the face of the document, that Judith went out from the camp to the fountain at Bethulia for the purpose of bathing or washing her whole person" (p. 459)?

She could not be in the camp and out of the camp at the same time, as Dr. Carson's language implies; and besides the record is that she "baptized herself, in the camp, at (*epi*) a fountain of water." Then he says that she "went out from the camp, . . . for the purpose of . . . washing her whole person." That is not in the record. "She baptized herself." In Judith (x. 2, 3) it is said that she "went down into the house," and after disrobing herself, she "washed her body all over with water." This was before she went to the tent of Holofernes. The Greek is, "*Perieklusato* to soma udati." Dr. Carson wants to make *ebaptizeto* "wash her whole person," but it will never do it. When that was done, *perieklusato* was required to perform the act. Then he asks "Why did she leave the tent," if a "small basin of water," would answer the purpose of purification? That question is just as easily answered as it is asked. Her object in this whole business was to take off the head of Holofernes and carry it to her people. She deceived him completely in carrying out her purpose. In her prayer (Judith ix. 10) she says: "Smite by the *deceit* of my lips the servant with the prince, and the prince with the servant." A part of the scheme was to have the way open for her escape as soon as the deed was done. Hence, when her plans were laid before Holofernes, ostensibly for the destruction of Israel, but in reality for the overthrow of the Assyrian army, she said: "Let my lord now command that thine handmaid may go forth unto prayer." He then "commanded his guard that they should not stay her; thus she abode in the camp three days, and went out in the night into the valley of Bethulia." So she passed the guard, in going out and

returning the first, the second, and the third night, without any suspicion. Then the fourth night, after causing Holofernes to drink "more wine than he had drunk at any time in one day since he was born," and after cutting off his head with his own falchion, she and her maid passed the guard, the maid carrying the head of Holofernes "in her bag of meat; so they twain went together *according to their custom unto prayer*, and when they had passed the camp, they compassed the valley and went up the mountain of Bethulia, and came to the gates thereof." So it is perfectly manifest that if she had remained in the tent, and had performed the rites of purification there, she would have had no way of escape. This is one reason for going to the fountain for purification. This was a religious purification, and any vessels furnished by Holofernes for carrying water to the tent for the purification of Judith, would be to her unclean, and water thus brought would be unclean. She "could not use in a religious rite water furnished by a heathen." She would not eat or drink of that which Holofernes sent to her lest it "be an offense." "Then she took and ate and drank before him what her maid had prepared." The Jews desired "running water" for their purifications (Num. xix. 17). Josephus speaks of it as "living water," and uses the same word (*les peges*) as is used in the case of Judith. She could use nothing that heathenish hands had handled. In her final prayer she says: "Make my speech and deceit to be their wound and stripe" (verse 13).

I will give some reasons why she did not immerse herself:

1. The army of Holofernes "camped in the valley

near unto Bethulia by (*epi*) the fountain" (Judith vii. 3). In verse 7 it is said he took the fountains of their waters, "and set garrisons of men of war over them." Judith did not go "from the camp," as Dr. Carson says she did, nor was "she in such a part of it as afforded her the necessary seclusion," but she "baptized (purified) herself at (*epi*) a fountain of water in the camp." The army of Holofernes was camped at this same fountain of water, and a guard of soldiers was stationed over it. Dr. Carson says she went to the fountain "for the purpose of bathing, or washing her whole person" (Carson on Baptism, p. 459). Now to suppose that that was done in the presence of a military guard is absolutely incredible.

2. Dr. Fuller says: "She bathed in the fountain. She was, of course, dressed in proper apparel." There is not the shadow of proof upon record to support either one of these assertions. They are groundless conceits. But then he says: "As to leave no doubt, however, as to her bathing, it is expressly said that 'she came out of the water.'" "Expressly" means, "In direct terms." Then we would expect to find these identical words, but they are not in the record. It is in the record, however, that "she went down (*kata*) at night, into the valley of Bethulia, and baptized herself in the camp at a fountain of water." This record puts her in the valley but not in the water. Then on her return to the tent, it says (*kai os anabe*), "and as she went up she prayed the Lord God of Israel to direct her way." Now where do we find it expressly said, that "she came out of the water?" Dr. Fuller renders, *anabe*, "she came out." But the lexicons give it no such meaning. Then he adds, "the water," from

his own fruitful imagination. Some of the sons of Esau, after holding a conference with Holofernes, it is said, "went up (*anebesan*) and camped in the hill-country" (Judith vii. 18). Does that mean that the sons of Esau came out of the water? Certainly not, and yet the same word is used (*anebesan*). In Genesis (xxiv. 16) we have a similar use of the word. And Rebekah "went down to the well (*kattabasa de epi ten pegen*) and filled her pitcher, and came up (*kai anebe*). Now who would have the temerity to render *kai anebe*, in this case, "She came out of the water?" And yet that is exactly what Dr. Fuller does in the case of Judith. The language used in the Septuagint in this case will not allow Judith to go into the fountain of water.

3. The Jewish rite of purification required no immersion of the person to be purified. In John (ii. 6) we have this language: "And there were set there six waterpots of stone, after the manner of the purifying of the Jews, containing two or three firkins apiece." The Jews purified themselves at these waterpots by the use of the water, but they did not immerse themselves in them. That was impossible. The law of Moses is (Num. viii. 7): "And thus shalt thou do unto them, to cleanse them: Sprinkle water of purifying upon them." That is all that was required of Judith. "But the man that is unclean, and will not purify himself, that soul shall be cut off from among the congregation, because . . . the water of separation hath not been sprinkled upon him." For the mode by which Judith was baptized and purified, we have a "thus saith the Lord"—it was by sprinkling.

4. One more point is worthy of consideration in this

case. Dr. Carson says that Judith went to the "fountain at Bethulia for the purpose of bathing, or washing her whole person." Dr. Fuller says: "She bathed in the fountain." Dr. Conant says: It was "by walking into the water to a proper depth, and then sinking down till the whole body was immersed." This all seems to be perfectly plain to these three champions of strict immersion, but there is nothing of that in the history of the case. The simple statement is that "she baptized herself at a fountain." Then they do not agree as to how it was done. Dr. Carson says it was by "washing;" Dr. Fuller says it was by "bathing," and Dr. Conant says it was by "walking in" and "sinking down." If that military guard could tell what they knew of the transaction, it is likely that they would say that neither one of them is correct. They would say: Our water supply for ourselves and all this army is that fountain. Consequently we never permitted Judith to "wash her whole person" in it, nor to "bathe" in it, neither "to walk into" it and "sink down." We are personally interested in the cleanliness of its waters, and guard over it, and eye-witnesses to all that takes place thereat. These being facts in the case, it is very certain, that Judith never immersed herself in the fountain of Bethulia.

5. *Baptizo* makes no demands for an immersion in the case. This point has been so elaborately discussed, and proven, in the preceding pages of this work, that it is only necessary to state it here.

There is another text in the Apocrypha we wish to notice. In the Septuagint it is, Wisdom of Seirach (ch. 31, ver. 30): "He that being baptized from a dead body and toucheth it again what availeth his washing?"

The process of purification from the touch of a dead body was by sprinkling (Num. xix). In verse sixteen it is said: "Whosoever toucheth . . . a dead body . . . shall be unclean seven days." "And for an unclean person they shall take of the ashes of the burnt heifer of purification for sin, and running water shall be put thereto in a vessel" (verse 17). "And a clean person shall take hyssop, and dip it in the water, and sprinkle it upon . . . him that touched . . . one dead" (verse 18). "And the clean person shall sprinkle upon the unclean on the third day, and on the seventh day" (verse 19). Now that is the law of the application of the water for the purification of one who had touched a dead body, and that is exactly what the Septuagint says is baptism. It is the word of the Lord, and there is no way of evading it. In verse twenty, it is said: "The man that shall be unclean, and shall not purify himself, that soul shall be cut off from among the congregation, because . . . the water of separation hath not been sprinkled upon him." That shows that the sprinkling of the water of separation upon the unclean person was the limit of the requirement. I wish to notice a quibble that Dr. Carson makes upon the latter part of verse nineteen. It reads: "And on the seventh day he (i. e. the person sprinkling water upon the unclean) shall purify himself, and wash his clothes, and wash (*lousetai*) himself with water." He says: "The word *loutron* here refers to the thing done to the person by his baptism" (Carson on Baptism, p. 455). He makes it refer to the person that was being purified. I make it refer to the person that was performing the rite of purification. One text of Scripture shall decide the matter. It is said in verse twenty-one: "And it

shall be a perpetual statute unto them, that he that sprinkleth the water of separation *shall wash his clothes,*" etc. That settles it by statute—a positive law. This is a case of baptism, by sprinkling, "beyond a peradventure." I now close this part of the discussion with two observations.

1. In regard to *Bapto*. Baptist writers, prior to the time of Dr. Carson's appearance as a leader, held on with an iron grip to the theory that *bapto* "signifies nothing else but to dip" (Gale's *Reflections on Wall's History of Infant Baptism*, p. 72). Then he says (page 62): "Nay, I do not remember one passage, where all other senses are not necessarily excluded besides dipping." It was then held that *bapto*, from necessity, had but one meaning, and that was dip. Dr. Carson (*Mode of Baptism*, p. 19) says: "*Bapto* has two meanings." After seeing Dr. Gale laboring to dip a lake into the blood of a mouse, he says: "Never was there such a figure" (p. 48). He says: "The blood was poured into the lake" (*ibid*). On the same page it is written: "The expression is literal, and has not the smallest difficulty." This takes it out of the land of figures. The lake was colored then, by the blood of the mouse, literally pouring into it. He quotes from Hippocrates the following language (p. 44): "When it *drops* upon the garments, they are dyed." Then adds: "This surely is not dyeing by dipping." On page 46 he says: "*Bapto* signifies to dye by sprinkling, as properly as by dipping." He says, from the renderings of *bapto* in these examples, "They are as literal as the primary meaning" (*ibid*). The example that Dr. Carson produces from Greek authors, his comments upon them, and his admission of the facts in the case, ought

forever to silence *bapto* in the discussion of the mode of baptism. It is not a word of one meaning.

2. *Baptizo*. The Greek usage of *baptizo* establishes the fact that it is not a word of one meaning. Paul said truly, when he spoke of that which stood in meats and drinks, and divers (*diaphorais*, different kinds of) baptisms. The Greeks used it in speaking of ships that were sunk, and forever remained at the bottom of the ocean, and of wine in a goblet baptized by pouring water into it, and all Asia baptized by one battle, and a man baptized by (drinking) much wine, and Elijah's altar baptized by water being poured upon it, and a reclaimed backslider baptized by his own tears, and a bed was baptized by one man's tears, and water was baptized by the Holy Spirit coming upon it, and a man was baptized (purified from the touch of a dead body) by water sprinkled upon him. Dr. Carson said whenever as good evidence was produced in favor of a secondary meaning of *baptizo*, as he had shown for a secondary meaning of *bapto*, he would submit the question. That evidence is now upon record. He said the admission of a secondary meaning of *bapto*, "solved difficulties that were clumsily got over by some of the ablest writers on that side of the question." That is also true of these same writers in their discussion of *baptizo*. I have counted not less than twenty-one words that Baptist writers use in defending the theory that *baptizo* means nothing else but dip "through all Greek literature." This is Dr. Carson's position, but he admits that all commentators and lexicographers are against him (p. 55). He says: "The meaning of a word must ultimately be determined by an actual inspection of the passages in which it occurs" (p. 56). That is

exactly what we have done in regard to *baptizo*, and we have thus proven that Dr. Carson's theory is utterly false. There is no appeal in this case to any higher authority than the Greek language itself, and this establishes the fact that there is as much evidence of a secondary meaning to *baptizo* as to *bapto*, and consequently *baptizo* as well as *bapto* should be withdrawn from the controversy.

3. We come now to an examination of the mode of baptism from a Bible standpoint. We have seen that the Greeks utterly repudiate the theory of dip and nothing but dip through all Greek literature, as the meaning of *baptizo*. That theory has no foundation in Greek literature. The first Scripture text to which attention is called is Ezek. xxxvi. 25, 26, 27. The twenty-sixth verse reads: "A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you, and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh." The twenty-seventh verse: "And I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes." These texts of Scripture teach the doctrine of regeneration. It is New Testament phraseology. "Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his" (Rom. viii. 9). The man in whom the Spirit of God dwells is a Christian. David said: "Take not thy holy Spirit from me" (Ps. li. 11). Now we have the outward symbol to represent this spiritual cleansing. It is in the twenty-fifth verse: "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean." We see from this that the sprinkling of clean water upon the man that had "a new heart," and "a new spirit," and the Spirit of God within him, was a sign and seal of the work of the

Holy Spirit in the heart. Didymus Alexandrinus says this is "the very image of baptism," as prophesied by Ezekiel, "I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and you shall be clean from all your sins." If the sprinkling of clean water upon the people in the time of Ezekiel's ministry, was a symbol of spiritual purification, so it is a symbol of the same work of grace under the gospel dispensation. Isaiah li. 15, is the next Scripture to be examined: "So shall he sprinkle many nations." This text, for several reasons, is a very important one.

1. The same Hebrew verb which is used here occurs more than twenty times in the Old Testament, and in every case it is used in the sense of sprinkling, and can have no other meaning, unless this is an exception. This statement is made upon the authority of Dr. Beard (Lectures on Theology, vol. iii., p. 194).

Dr. Foster refers to Isa. lii. 15; Ezek. xxxvi. 25, and some other texts, and says: "That these Old Testament sprinklings should have been called baptisms by the Jews and Jewish Christians of the New Testament period, is easily accounted for by the fact that the latter word had in their day come to be one of the accepted equivalents of the former" (Systematic Theology, pp. 750, 751).

Then Paul refers to these same Old Testament sprinklings and calls them "divers baptisms" (Heb. ix. 10). From these facts it is evident that sprinkling in the apostolic age had come to be an equivalent of baptism. It is worthy of notice also that Greek writers of this age never did enter an objection.

2. The prophet means Christ when he says: "So shall he sprinkle many nations." There is no dispute on this point. It was a prophecy that was to be after-

ward fulfilled. It must be fulfilled by Christ in person, or by his commissioned agents. In either way the transaction was legitimate. "Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John, though Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples" (John iv. 1, 2). But still they were disciples of Jesus, as truly as if he had baptized them himself.

3. Just before the ascension of Christ from earth to glory he said to his disciples: "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth." "Go ye, therefore, and disciple all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." I make the following remarks, upon this text, in connection with the one in Isaiah now under consideration.

1. The work referred to in both texts, is the work of the same person, Christ. There can be no controversy on that point. 2. The work to be performed is to be upon the same class of people—"many nations," "all nations." In Matthew the word in the Greek is *ethne*, Gentile. In Isaiah, the Septuagint has the same word, Gentiles. The prophet Isaiah, in speaking of the Messiah, says he shall be "for a light of the Gentiles" (Isa. xlii. 6). "And the Gentiles shall come to thy light" (Isa. lx. 3). 3. These prophecies were never fulfilled, in whole, nor in part, until after Christ gave the commission to the apostles. Peter had to be convinced by a miracle that he ought to preach the gospel to the people "in every nation," "and they of the circumcision" . . . "were astonished, . . . because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost" (Acts x. 45). And now the Gentiles began to be converted, and began to be baptized. This is the "New Testament period," in which the "Jewish Christians,"

began to call these "Old Testament sprinklings baptisms." I see no reason to doubt the fact that Isaiah's prophecy—so shall he sprinkle many nations—is being fulfilled under the commission given by Christ to the apostles. The very identical people that Isaiah said should be sprinkled, the commission says shall be baptized. 4. If the Hebrew word in Isaiah that is rendered sprinkle, had been a word that meant dip or immerse, that would have been considered a settlement of the question. If that were the case, we could hear it from every immersionist pulpit in Christendom, and from every hilltop and valley, and read it on the printed page: Why the prophet settles the question of the mode of baptism, what need have we of any further proof? But now just the reverse of that is true. In speaking of this text, Albert Barnes says: "The universal signification of the Hebrew word *naza* in the Old Testament is to sprinkle." 5. I claim that the interpretation which I have given of this text and the application, are both natural and easy. I am not under the necessity of making strained efforts to get meanings out of the word *naza* that are not in it.

The application is just what would commend itself to the common sense judgment of every man, if it were not that there is an adverse theory to be sustained. I do not admit that there is any fallacy in my reasonings in the case, nor any wrong use of terms in the application. The word means exactly what I claim for it. And sprinkling is used in the sense of baptism, if the Greeks understood Greek.

Cyril, of Jerusalem, said: "Thou seest the power of baptism. Be of good courage, O Jerusalem. . . . He will sprinkle upon you clean water and ye shall be

purified from all your sins." Cyril, in this case, declares unequivocally that this baptism was performed by sprinkling. No appeal can be made from the Greeks. I know that strenuous efforts have been made to wrest this text of Scripture from its literal meaning, in order to prevent its being used against the theory of immersion. Various interpretations have been suggested, but none of them seem to be satisfactory, even to those who make them. Some critics say that it seems to have a peculiar meaning, but what that meaning is they do not know. Some say if it means to sprinkle with water, it ought to say that. Christ gave the commission to the apostles to baptize, but he did not say with water, but we are told that that is understood; and that is true also in the other case. Where there is no agreement amongst critics, then every man must be his own critic. The obvious meaning of the text, is generally the true one.

THE BAPTISM OF JOHN.

The preaching and baptism of John the Baptist were a preparatory work. He says of Christ: "And I knew him not, but that he should be made manifest to Israel, therefore am I come baptizing with water" (John i. 31). The angel said of him that he should "make ready a people prepared for the Lord." John was a priest, in the regular line of priests. His father, Zacharias, was an officiating priest when he was born. His baptism was not the Christian baptism. It was under the Jewish dispensation. The mode of his baptism is the question for immediate consideration. Dr. Carson says that it was immersion. The word *baptizo* decides that. There was, however, no law in the Jewish ritual that required immersion. Ambrose, who was one of the Latin fathers, says: "He who wished to be cleansed by typical baptism was sprinkled with the blood of the lamb by a bunch of hyssop." The blood of the lamb applied by sprinkling was baptism. The sprinkling of the blood of the lamb and John's baptism were both under the Jewish dispensation. Suppose John applied the water to the people by sprinkling, was it baptism? I quote from Ambrose because of his knowledge of language. He was contemporary with some of the early Greek fathers. But we are told that John baptized in the river Jordan, and that that settles the mode. In Matt. iii. 6, it is said, that the people "were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins." In Mark i. 5, it is

said that they "were all baptized of him in the river of Jordan, confessing their sins." The question that we want now to consider is this: Does the language which we have quoted from Matthew and Mark, necessarily put John and the people into the water, or only within the banks of the Jordan? Dr. Carson says that *en potomo* means "in the river;" that is, "within the banks of the river" (Carson on Baptism, p. 338). Then on page 339 he says: "He might be in the river, yet not in the water: all within the banks is the river." It is not settled then, beyond a doubt, that John and his disciples were in the water at all. He says on pages 336-7: "Instead of keeping John the Baptist ten hours every day in the water, I will not oblige him to go into the water at all; he might have stood on the brink." As to the language used by any of the evangelists is concerned, it is true that "he might have stood on the brink." Then on page 131 he says: "I think there is no reason to believe that John the Baptist usually went into the water in baptizing." That is a very reasonable conclusion. But then he says, on page 336: "If John did not immerse his disciples, the narrative of the evangelist is false." That is to say: My theory is true, whether that part of God's word is true or not. How John could stand on the brink and immerse his disciples in the water of the Jordan I do not know. I suppose Dr. Carson knew. It is said also that "John was baptizing in the wilderness." But it has never been claimed, so far as I know, that John ever immersed any one into the wilderness. And yet the phraseology (*en te eremo*) "in the wilderness," is exactly similar to the phraseology (*en to Iordane*) in the Jordan. The first expression proves that he was bap-

tizing within the limits of the wilderness; the other proves that he was baptizing within the limits of the Jordan. And we have proven by Dr. Carson that although John was in the Jordan, he was not necessarily in the water. It is said in John i. 28, that "these things were done in Bethabara, beyond Jordan, where John was baptizing." "These things" relate to all that was done in the interview between John, and the priests and Levites, sent to him by the Jews from Jerusalem, "to ask him, Who art thou?" It required nine verses to make the record. These things were done where (*opou*) i. e. at which place where John was baptizing. It was not in the Jordan. The record is that it was in Bethabara, beyond Jordan. Dr. Carson was so determined to make this read so that it would sustain his theory that he says: "It might have been added to John's account that the Baptist was baptizing in Jordan" (Carson on Baptism, p. 125). Yes; "it might have been added," but that would not make it true. Then, on the same page, he also says that "John was baptizing in Bethabara in the Jordan." Now we are told that John was baptizing in Bethabara, but that John and Bethabara were both "in the Jordan." The record is that Bethabara is beyond (*peran*) the Jordan. I have never found yet, in any Greek lexicon, or in any other Greek, that *peran* ever means in. In John x. 40, it is said of Jesus that he "went away again beyond Jordan into the place where John at first baptized, and there he abode." Now Jesus went to the place at which John at first baptized, "and there he abode," and that was beyond Jordan.

Now I want to prove from the language as given in Joshua, third chapter, Septuagint version, that

although John was in the Jordan, yet he was not in the water, and never went into it. In the eighth verse it is said: "When ye are come to (*epi*) the brink of the water of the Jordan, ye shall stand still in Jordan" (*en to Iordane*). This is exactly the same phraseology as is used in Matt. iii. 6 (*en to Iordane*). The priests were only at the brink, or edge, of the water, but they were in the Jordan. Now the priests and John were in the same attitude as to the waters of the Jordan. The priests were at (*epi*) the edge of the water. And many came to (*epi*) John's baptism. We notice in the fifteenth verse that it required another movement to bring even the feet of the priests into the water. This is expressed by the Greek verb *eiseporeuonto*, and it means, to go in. If it required this additional Greek verb to put the priests into the water, then how did John get into the water without any such a verb? It is in proof that the priests moved from their position. It is also in proof that John baptized in his position.

But it is claimed that the preposition *eis* did put John into the water of the Jordan, so that he immersed his disciples. Let us see whether that is a necessity or not. In the Septuagint, 4th Kings vi. 4, it is said that Elisha and the sons of the prophets "came unto (*eis*) the Jordan." They were not in the water of the Jordan, but near by, and there "they cut down wood." We take another example from 4th Kings ii. 6. 7: "And Elijah said to him, Remain here, for the Lord hath sent me to (*eis*) Jordan." Elijah and Elisha went on and came to the Jordan, but they were not in it. "Then fifty men of the sons of the prophets," "stood to view afar off," and they saw that Elijah and Elisha "stood by (*epi*) the Jordan." They had come to (*eis*)

the Jordan, and were standing by (*epi*) the Jordan, but they were not in it.

Then in verse twenty-one of the same chapter, it is said that "Elisha went out unto (*eis*) the spring of the waters, and cast salt in there." Elisha went to the edge of the waters, but not into them. Dr. Carson says that verbs of motion, in connection with *eis*, always put the person into the water, if water is the regimen. But these examples (and many others could be given) show that that is not the case. We have now given a sufficiency of proof to show that John baptized in the Jordan simply as a locality, just as he baptized in the wilderness as a locality.

When the priests were standing at the brink of the water in Jordan, it required another verb to put them into the water; but when John occupied a similar position in Jordan, without any additional verb of movement, he there baptized the people. One of the most incredible things in connection with John's baptism, is to suppose that he stood in the turbulent and rapidly flowing waters of the Jordan long enough to immerse the great numbers that came to his baptism. Dr. Carson saw this difficulty and said that he would not "oblige him to go into the water at all; he might have stood on the brink." That was his position, but then did he immerse the people?

THE BAPTISM OF CHRIST.

It is said in Matt. iii. 13, "Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to (*epi*) Jordan unto John, to be baptized of him." *Epi* means on or at the Jordan. Then in verse 16 it is said: "And Jesus, when he was baptized went up straightway out of the water." The word in this text that is rendered "out of," is *apo*. The ordinary meaning of *apo* is from, and not out of. The Revised Version and the Baptist translation of the New Testament, both render this "from the water." Dr. Carson says: "I deny that it (*apo*) ever signifies *out of*" (p. 337). Now we have two translations, saying that Jesus came up from the water, and Dr. Carson agrees with them, and that is all the Greek requires.

Mark records the baptism of Jesus in these words: "And . . . Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee and was baptized of John in (*eis*) Jordan. And straightway coming up out of (*apo*) the water." Mark uses *eis*, which has in, or at, as meanings when not repeated. He uses *apo*, from; the same word that Matthew uses. "And coming up from the water." He went to the water and came up from the water, is all that the Greek requires. All that Luke says is "that Jesus also being baptized, . . . returned from (*apo*) Jordan." It is not proven by the language, as given by any of the evangelists, nor all of them, that John was in the water of the Jordan when he baptized Christ, nor does it appear that Christ was immersed. "He might be in

the river, yet not in the water" (Carson, p. 339). In Matthew, the Revised Version and the Baptist translation both render *apo* from, and in Mark they both render it "out of." Why they do this in recording the same event is not explained. If he came up from the water, as they say in Matthew, then he did not come out of the water, as they say in Mark. John said to the Pharisees and Sadducees who were coming to his baptism: "O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from (*apo*) the wrath to come" (Matt. iii. 7)? Now they could not flee "out of" the wrath, for it had not yet come. Liddell and Scott say that the "original sense of *apo* is from, whether a place, or a time, or any object, from which a thing goes forth, is derived, or parted." And of the great number of examples they give, there is not one at variance with from, or away from. And they never give "out of" as one of the meanings of *apo*.

But then we are asked, Why did Christ go to John at the Jordan at all if it were not that he might be immersed? We have noticed the fact already that John's position in the Jordan was not in the water. But Dr. Carson says: "If baptism had not been by immersion, there can be no adequate cause alleged for going to the river" (Carson on Baptism, p. 126). He says on the same page: "If a handful of water would have sufficed for baptism, then why go to the river?" An answer to this may be had from other writings. Homer says that "Telemachus went to the sea for a religious purification by means of its waters" (Quoted in Johannic Baptism by Dr. Dale, p. 333). Well, says Dr. Carson, inasmuch as it was a religious purification, it must have been a religious washing, and that could

only be by immersion. But this old Greek says that he went to the sea for the purpose of "washing his hands." Dr. Carson says: "Can sober judgment, can candor suppose that if a handful of water would have sufficed for baptism, they would have gone to the river?" Why did Telemachus go to the sea for a hand washing, when a handful of water was sufficient. "Can sober judgment answer?"

It is a fact that both Jew and Gentile attached special importance to running water as a purifying agency. Dr. Dale quotes from the old Roman historian Livy, the language of the Roman high priest to one about to offer sacrifice to Diana. He says: "Would you sacrifice impurely to Diana? Sprinkle yourself first with the living stream. The Tiber flows before you in the bottom of the valley." This would be a clear case of immersion with Dr. Carson, if the Roman priest had not used the word sprinkle. If he had said, "Purify yourself with the living stream," Dr. Carson would say of the man that doubted that being a clear case of immersion, "that he was not to be reasoned with." Why go to the Tiber when a handful of water would suffice? Can sober judgment answer?

Philo, the Jew, says: "It is the custom of nearly all others to sprinkle themselves for purification with pure water, many with that of the sea, some with that of rivers, and some with that which in vessels they have drawn up from wells." Why, says Carson, go to the sea and rivers when a handful of water is sufficient? The Bible speaks of running water for purifying purposes. In Lev. xiv. 51, it is said that the priest "shall take the cedar wood, and the hyssop; and the scarlet, and the living bird, and dip them in the blood of the

slain bird, and in the *running* water, and sprinkle the house seven times." Then it is said: "This is the law for all manner of leprosy." It must be running water. Then Hesiod, an old Greek writer, said: "Before prayer the hands should be washed in pure flowing water." Virgil says: "Sprinkling the body with river water." Christ came to the Jordan to be baptized because John was there, and John was there because of the character of the water. If there had been at that very spot a great pool of standing water instead of the Jordan, John would not have been there; and yet the facilities for immersion would have been just as good. The Bible doctrine is: "I will sprinkle clean water upon you." All of these facts give a sufficient reason why Christ was baptized at the Jordan, without intimating that he was immersed.

But Dr. Carson claims that all the arguments of those who oppose immersion are evasive on this point. Well, some additional facts may not appear so. In third Kings of the Septuagint, and first chapter, we have an account of Solomon being anointed king over Israel. David, his father, gives the instructions: "And the king said unto them, take the servants of your lord, and cause Solomon my son to ride upon mine own mule, and bring him down to (*eis*) Gihon." The Gihon is a small stream of water near Jerusalem. "So Zadok the priest, and Nathan the prophet, . . . went down and caused Solomon to ride upon King David's mule and brought him to (*eis*) Gihon." We have in these examples the preposition *eis*, in connection with a verb of motion, and the termination at a stream of water. Now if this were the Jordan, and John the Baptist the officiating priest, and Dr. Carson solving the question,

it would certainly be a clear case of immersion. But there is something more in the record yet. "And Zadok the priest and Nathan the prophet anointed him king in (*en*) the Gihon." We have in these quotations a case of going to (*eis*) the Gihon, a stream of water. Now will "sober judgment and candor" dip Solomon into the Gihon? Then why lead away to the Gihon? We have also, according to Dr. Carson, those strongest possible words (*eis ten* Gihon), into the Gihon. Then what prevents a case of immersion? Nothing at all, only that there was none. Solomon was simply anointed king in the Gihon. And then it is said: "That they came up from thence." We have in this example a case of going down to the water, and of coming up from the water, but no immersion. We have also a case in the book of Tobit, one of the apocryphal books of the Old Testament. It is found in the Septuagint, sixth chapter and first verse. The young man and the angel as "they went on their journey, came in the evening to (*epi*) the river Tigris, and they lodged there." The angel and Tobias camped near the river, but not in the water. Justin Martyr says that Jesus came to be baptized while John yet dwelt upon (*epi*) the Jordan. Justin understood that John was near the Jordan, but not in the water. Matthew says that Jesus came upon (*epi*) the Jordan to John, to be baptized of him. The phraseology in all these cases is the same. The young man and the angel were near the river Tigris, but not in the water. It is likewise clear that although John and the Savior were near the river Jordan, yet they were not in the water.

There is a very ancient work now extant, called the "Constitutions of the Holy Apostles." It is regarded

by literary men as a genuine work. It is in the seventh volume of Ante-Nicene Fathers, p. 460. My quotations from the Ante-Nicene Fathers are all made from the American edition of the Christian Literature Company. Professor Riddle, in the Introductory Notice to this work says: "It is proven to contain matter of a very ancient date." Dr. Donaldson, in his Introductory Notice, says: "Earlier writers were inclined to assign them to the apostolic age, . . . but much discussion ensued, and the questions to which they gave rise are still unsettled." Mr. Whiston, a Baptist of England, who translated the work from the Greek into English, says that it is as "sacred as the canonical books of the New Testament."

In the quotation that I wish to make the writer is speaking of Christ. "If, therefore, before his coming he sought for a clean heart and a contrite spirit more than sacrifices, much rather would he abrogate those sacrifices, I mean those by blood, when he came. Yet he so abrogated them as that he first fulfilled them. For he was both circumcised, and sprinkled, and made use of the rest of their customs." No one will call in question the fact that he was circumcised and baptized. This very ancient document says that he was sprinkled. I know of nothing that can set it aside. It has passed the close examination of a number of very learned men, and was translated into English by a Baptist.

I wish to make a quotation from Dr. Robinson's History of Baptism. In this history he embraces the whole subject of baptism. The first edition was published in England in A.D. 1790. Then it has been republished in the United States. He was a Baptist, but his history was intended to cover the whole ground. He

gives a picture of John baptizing Christ, which was found in the dome of an ancient church at Ravenna. He says: "Over the head of Jesus is the dove. On the left-hand bank, in a short, thin, violet-colored cloak, stands John the Baptist, inclining over the river, holding in his left hand an ornamented cross taller than himself, and in his right hand a basin, or some such utensil, and pouring out of it water on the head of Jesus" (p. 91). The picture is in the work published in 1790. That is the description of the picture as given by Dr. Robinson, the great Baptist historian. It is said that the gospel was preached at Ravenna during the first century. Then he says: "It is further remarkable that this representation at Ravenna is not singular, for most artists of those ancient times describe the baptism of Jesus in the same manner" (p. 95).

These are singular things to be written in Baptist history if they were not true. I see no ground to doubt their truth. These historical facts, ancient as they are, go very far toward settling the mode of Christ's baptism. I see no discrepancy between the teaching of the Bible and history on this subject.

WHY WAS CHRIST BAPTIZED?

When Jesus came and asked baptism at the hands of John the Baptist, "John forbade him, saying, I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me?" "But Jesus answering said unto him, Suffer it to be so now: for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness." Attention is called to the little Greek word *outo*, which means in this way, or in like manner. It cannot be done any other way. There must be some law of righteousness fulfilled in Christ's baptism. The law re-

quired for the consecration of priests that they should be "washed with water," at the door of the tabernacle and in the presence of the congregation. Then the anointing oil was first poured upon their heads. After that the anointing oil and blood were to be sprinkled upon the priests and upon their garmens (Lev. viii. 6, 12, 30). It is said in Acts x. 38, that "God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power." This refers to the Holy Spirit coming upon him at his baptism. It was necessary also that water should be applied.

Albert Barnes supposes that Christ was baptized simply "to give the sanction of his example to the baptism of John." That certainly is a very flimsy reason.

Dr. Carson says it was the ordinary baptism of John. That is to say, that Christ was baptized for the same reason that the repenting Jews were. He says: "Personally, Jesus had no sins to confess, yet still there was a propriety in his submitting to the baptism of repentance" (Carson, p. 177). Then on the same page he says though he was "undefiled, yet as one with us he is defiled." Then again: "If we are guilty by being one with Adam, Christ was in like manner guilty by becoming one with us." This is certainly a very extreme position. It seems to have been taken in order to avoid the force of the argument drawn from the fact that by Christ's baptism, he was formally consecrated to the priestly office. Dr. Carson could see that if he were to admit this, the mode of Christ's baptism would be settled.

When Christ came to John for baptism he said, "Suffer it to be so *now*." Why did he say *now*? He was then thirty years old, the exact time at which priests

were consecrated and inducted into the priestly office. He says: "I came not to destroy, but to fulfill the law." If Christ had been baptized before this time, it would have been a violation of the law; and if it had been deferred until after this time, it would have been failing to fulfill the law.

In Acts (xix. 4) Paul says: "John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus." That was John's formula. I make two remarks upon this text. 1. John demanded repentance of those who came to his baptism. Christ could not repent. 2. He said to the people that they should believe on Christ Jesus. It would be foolishness to require Christ to believe on himself. These are requirements in John's baptism that are not applicable to Christ.

Dr. Robinson, the great English Baptist historian, says: "I baptize you," said John, "at, or upon your repentance, your invisible abhorrence of sin, manifested by fruits meet for repentance—that is, by reformation. Except in one instance, John baptized persons having these characters. That one instance was the baptism of Jesus. In perfect freedom, with eminent piety and virtue, but without any profession of repentance, Jesus was baptized. By this he entered upon his public ministry" (p. 33). This is a clear and explicit statement of the nature of John's ordinary baptism; and also of the baptism of Jesus, by which, that is, by the authority of which, he entered upon his public ministry. It was necessary that the priest should have authority before the people, authority that the people would recognize. "And Jesus went into the temple of God,

and cast out all them that sold and bought in the temple" (Matt. xxi. 12). And as he was teaching in the temple the chief priests and elders of the people said, "By what authority doest thou these things, and who gave thee this authority?" They saw that he was not acting in the capacity of a private individual. Then Jesus said, I also will ask you a question, and if you will answer me, then I will answer you: "The baptism of John, was it from heaven or of men?" Why did he in this connection refer to John's baptism? They demanded his authority, and he referred to the baptism of John. There was a reason for it. John was a priest, and Christ was exercising priestly authority. When he referred to the baptism of John, they knew from whence his authority came, but they were afraid to answer his question.

Some claim that Christ was baptized with Christian baptism, and that it was an example for the people to follow. But in John's baptism the people were all baptized before Christ was. That would make their baptism an example for him, but there are many objections to this theory.

First. Christ himself gave the command for Christian Baptism. He said to his disciples: "Go ye, therefore, and disciple all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost" (Matt. xxviii. 19). Before this commission was given Christian baptism was never administered to any person. The apostles were not to depart from Jerusalem until they had received the "promise of the Father." All rites and ceremonies and baptisms administered before the crucifixion of Christ were under the Jewish dispensation. It was necessary that the

apostles themselves should "receive power," but this could only be "after that the Holy Ghost had come upon them." The new dispensation was formally opened on the day of Pentecost.

Second. Christian baptism is an outward sign of the inward spiritual cleansing of the person baptized, and of the regeneration of his soul. If Christ received Christian baptism it signified the same thing to him that it does to us. If that were not the case it would not be Christian baptism. If it is Christian baptism at all, it signifies the same thing to all who receive it. Christ never needed or received any spiritual cleansing or regeneration of the soul, and consequently never needed, or received, a baptism that was a sign of ~~such~~ a work of grace.

Third. Christian baptism, if Christ had received it, would have required him to be baptized in his own name.

Fourth. Christ's baptism was ruled by law to thirty years of age. That is not the case with Christian baptism. There is no law regulating the age at which any one shall receive Christian baptism. Those who incorporate into their theory the doctrine that Christ was baptized as an example for us to follow, do not follow it themselves. Dr. Robinson says that Christ, by his baptism, "entered upon his public ministry."

THE BAPTISM OF PAUL.

The baptism of Paul took place in the house of Judas, on the street in Damascus called Straight. And Ananias was directed to "inquire in the house of Judas for . . . Saul of Tarsus." And then it is said that "Ananias went his way, and entered into the house." In that same house Ananias gave Paul some instructions, "and he received sight forthwith, and rising up, was baptized." The word rendered "forthwith" is *parachrema*, and is equivalent to the English expression, "on the spot." Then the reading of it is, he received his sight on the spot, and rising up (*anastas*), he was baptized. The proof that Paul was in the house, and that Ananias went into the same house, is so strong that language could make it no stronger. The proof that they left the house before the baptism took place is as blank as a sheet of white paper. Dr. Whitsitt says: "Let the following suffice as instances of the manner in which baptism in private houses was later performed at Muenster: 'Frau Van der Recke was first in Rothmann's house, where the gospel was proclaimed to herself and her daughters. Then one of the daughters fell upon her knees and received baptism, afterward the other, and last of all the mother'" (A Question in Baptist History, p. 44). In this case these women received baptism in the house while upon their knees; in Paul's case, he received baptism in the house while standing upon his feet. A few examples will establish

this fact. In Acts xiii. 16, it is said: "Then Paul stood up (*anastas*, standing up), and beckoning with his hand, said, Men of Israel, and ye that fear God, give audience." In this example, Paul was in a Jewish synagogue, a congregation of people were assembled, and the ruler of the synagogue asked him to give a "word of exhortation for the people." There is no question of Paul's attitude while he was delivering this exhortation. He was standing upon his feet. Then in Acts xi. 27, 28, we read: "And in these days came prophets from Jerusalem unto Antioch. And there stood up (*anastas*, standing up) one of them named Agabus." Agabus simply stood upon his feet while he spoke to the people. In Acts i. 15, it is said: "And . . . Peter stood up (*anastas*, standing up) in the midst of the disciples, and said." While in the attitude of standing he gave directions as to the propriety of selecting some one to fill the place of Judas. We read in Acts v. 34, that "there stood up (*anastas*, standing up) one in the council, a Pharisee, named Gamaliel, a doctor of the law." This Pharisee, while standing in that Jewish council, gave directions as to the disposition that should be made of the apostles. Also, in Acts xv. 7, it is said: "And when there had been much disputing, Peter rose up (*anastas*, standing up), and said unto them." This was in the noted assembly of the apostles and elders at Jerusalem, while considering the question of circumcision. Peter, on rising to his feet, made a speech to the members of the assembly, as to how God had sent him to the Gentiles. In Luke iv. 16, when Jesus came to Nazareth, it is said that "he went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day, and stood up (*aneste*) for to read." Now if similar phraseology can

establish any truth whatever, the examples which I have given prove the fact that Paul was standing upon his feet when he was baptized. Then being in a private house and standing upon his feet at the time of his baptism he could not be immersed. I have never known of an immersionist writer taking Paul's baptism to prove his doctrine; and if the writer speaks of it at all, it is only when an opponent calls his attention to it. One of Dr. Carson's opponents lays the case across his path, and he breaks out in his usual peevish eloquence in the following strain: "I care not if it was expressly said that he was baptized in the very room where he was then sitting, immediately after the address of Ananias." (That is said.) "This would not create the smallest difficulty. Yet I am utterly astonished that a literary man should interpret such forms of expression in this manner" (Carson on Baptism, p. 356). It was not unusual at all for Dr. Carson to be astonished when he met difficulties. But he thinks that some time might have elapsed "between the command and the execution, and at some distance from the place." That would require a different statement in the history of the case. But he goes to the Septuagint to prove his position. His first example is Ex. viii. 20, and his reading is: "Rise up early in the morning, and stand before Pharaoh." Then he says: "There was sometime before his rising and his standing before the king; and some space between the place where he rose, and where he afterward stood" (p. 357). But Dr. Carson does not give the reading as it is in the Septuagint. That is: "And the Lord said to Moses (*orthrison to proi*), coming in the morning, early, stand before Pharaoh." That takes every

particle of the force out of Dr. Carson's criticism. It matters not where Moses rose up, the participle 'coming' expresses the journey performed. So it is not a parallel case to the language used in Paul's baptism. His second example is, Deut. ii. 13, "Now rise up (*anastete*), and get you over the brook Zered." *Anastete* expresses nothing but the rising up, and the Greek verb *aparete* denotes the *passing* over the brook. His next example is the twenty-fourth verse of the same chapter: "Rise ye up (*anastete*), take your journey, and pass over the river Arnon." The word rendered take your journey is *aparete*, and then *parellhete*, means to pass over. Now in this example there are two verbs describing the journey from the point of rising up, until they were over the river. In Paul's case there is no verb between the rising up and the baptism. These examples are actually against Dr. Carson's theory.

I must now examine some passages of Scripture upon which Dr. J. M. Pendleton relies to prove that Paul left the house of Judas, and went out to some deep water and was there immersed. The first example he gives is Luke i. 39: "And Mary arose (*anastasa*) in those days, and went into the hill country." Then Dr. Pendleton asks the question, "Did Mary stand up and go?" Yes, Mary stood up and went. And there is a Greek verb in that sentence that Dr. Pendleton did not give, that shows how she went: "Mary arose . . . and went." *Eporenthe* is that verb, and it means, "to go away," "to depart." Then Dr. Pendleton asks the question, "Does not *anastasa* here denote the beginning of the process by which she reached the hill country" (Three Reasons Why I Am a Baptist, p. 141)? *Anastasa* denotes the rising up, and no more. *Eporenthe* expresses

the journey to the hill country. Then he gives the case of the prodigal son. Luke xv. 18: "I will arise (*anastas*) and go (*poreusomai*) to my father." Dr. Pendleton asks the question, "Was not the *anastas* the commencement of the returning movement?" The *anastas* was simply the rising up, and a verb that Dr. Pendleton does not give was the returning movement. That verb is *poreusomai*. And it means: "I will go." *Anastas*, rising up, *poreusomai*, I will go. Dr. Pendleton says: "Now Luke wrote the Acts of the Apostles." Then he says: "Is it not reasonable to believe that when he says (Acts ix. 18) that Saul arose (*anastis*) and was baptized, he means by *anastas* the beginning of a process necessary to his baptism? He evidently arose that he might be immersed." He seems to think that because the prodigal son arose, and went to his father, therefore Paul arose and went somewhere too, but that is not a necessary consequence at all. I will now compare the phraseology in the two cases, and see the difference, if there is any.

The prodigal. *Anastas*, rising up; *poreusomai*, I will go to any father.

Paul. *Anastas*, rising up ——— was baptized.

That is a blank that can be seen. The prodigal son went from the place of rising up, and the very thing that proves that he did go, that being a blank in Paul's case, proves that he did not go. Dr. Pendleton gives another example in this same chapter: "And Peter (*anastas*) arose and went with them." It is a little singular that Dr. Pendleton gives the participle that denotes the rising up in every case, and never gives the verb that expresses the journey performed in one

single instance. I want now to put this last example that he gives by the side of Paul's case.

"And Peter, *anastas*, rising up, went with (*sunellthen*) them."

And Paul, *anastas*, rising up ——— was baptized.

If we take the wording in the case of Paul's baptism just as it stands (and that we must do), and put it in contrast with other examples that have been given, then the inevitable conclusion is, that Paul upon rising to his feet was immediately baptized. Dr. Pendleton says that "his immersion implied the movement indicated by *anastas*." The movement in *anastas* was rising to his feet, and nothing more. Then we have this language: "Peter rose up (*anastas*) and said unto them." Then Peter in rising up stood in that position, and made his speech. I suppose that that never was called in question. Well, why was it never called in question? Because there is nothing, not one word, that indicates that he moved from that position. The first item, and the only item, that is recorded after his rising up is his speech. Then it is said that Paul "received sight forthwith, and *anastas*, rising up, was baptized." The first item that is recorded of Paul after rising up is his baptism. Peter and Paul did exactly the same thing, in the first movement, and just at the termination of that movement Peter made a speech. But Dr. Pendleton says that Paul went out to some deep water and was immersed. It is a fact, however, that Luke does not say one word about that. He makes a very plain statement, of a very plain fact, and that is, that Paul on rising up was baptized. I must take Luke's statement as true to the letter, until I get some additional light on the subject; and then that light

must come from a better source, than that that Luke has given in this account.

There is one more item to be considered in this transaction, and that is the fidelity of Luke as a historian. Did he tell all the truth in regard to Paul's baptism? He was one of "Paul's company" in his evangelistic work. We must admit that he knew the facts, but did he tell them? In speaking of Paul at another time in a Jewish synagogue, he says: "Then Paul stood up (*anastas*), . . . and said, Men of Israel, and ye that fear God, give audience." We all believe that, and we believe that Paul was standing upon his feet when he made that speech; and we also believe that *anastas* put him upon his feet. Then Luke gives an account of Paul's conversion, as recorded in Acts, twenty-second chapter. In that account it is said: "And the Lord said unto me, arise (*anastas*) and go, (*porenon*) into Damascus."

We all believe that that is a true record. Paul first arose (*anastas*), then he went (*porenon*) to Damascus. Now in this case, as well as every other case, the participle denotes the rising up, and a separate verb expresses the journey performed. And if there is no moving from the place of rising up, then there is no verb. We come again to the case with a defective record, if there was any immersion performed. Luke says of Paul, "and (*anastas*) rising up, he was baptized." Luke has nothing between the rising up and the baptism. And that is the point that is so defective, with Dr. Carson and Dr. Pendleton; and they both undertake to supply it. When the Lord wanted Paul in Damascus he told him just how to get there. If he had wanted him at some stream of water to be immersed, he would

have told him just how to go. And I think it would have been a much more consistent record than the one made by Drs. Carson and Pendleton. But their attempts to correct the record show that in their judgment, as Luke made it, and as it stands now, Paul was not immersed.

Now the facts elicited in this discussion are mainly these, to wit: That Paul was baptized in the house of Judas, and that that took place while he was standing upon his feet. I believe that Luke wrote the account of his baptism, just as it took place, without the addition of a superfluous word, or without the omission of a word that was necessary to complete the history.

THE BAPTISM OF THE JAILER.

The facts in connection with the baptism of the jailer make it very certain that he was not immersed. But Dr. Carson says the word *baptizo* settles that question. He says, when he has proven that it means immerse in one case, that settles its meaning in every case, unless it can be shown that immersion in that particular case is impossible. We will give one instance in which immersion was impossible. Gregory Nazianzen, a Greek by birth and education, speaks of a man who baptized his bed. But Dr. Carson can readily dispose of that case. The man carried his bed to a river and dipped it into the water. But Gregory said more than that. He said that the man baptized his bed nightly with his tears. His tears dropped from his eyes upon the bed and baptized it. Dr. Carson admits that if an immersion was impossible then there was none. We have a baptism in this case, but it was impossible that there should be an immersion.

The baptism of the jailer is recorded in the sixteenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. After the magistrates "had laid many stripes upon" Paul and Silas, "they cast them into prison, charging the jailer to keep them safely," "who, having received such a charge, thrust them into the inner prison." Paul and Silas were first "cast into prison," and then they were "thrust into the inner prison." The apostles prayed and sang praises at midnight, and there was a great earthquake,

and the foundations of the prison were shaken, and immediately the prison doors were opened." The word rendered "immediately" is *parachrema*, and means "on the spot." Then the meaning is, that the doors were opened *on the spot*. We will have use for this further on. The jailer, "when he saw the doors open, would have killed himself, supposing that the prisoners had fled," but Paul cried out: "Do thyself no harm, for we are all here." The jailer called for a light, and came "trembling and fell down before Paul and Silas, and brought them out." Paul and Silas had been taken from the outer prison, and put into the inner prison. Then when the jailer "brought them out" of the inner prison, they were placed back in the outer prison. This is just as plain as language can make it. The instructions that were given to the jailer by Paul and Silas were in the outer prison. Then it is said: "He took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes." The word rendered "took" is *paralabon*, and it means "to take, or receive to one's self," and then "to learn or receive intellectually." So it does not mean that he took them away from the outer person, as we shall see further on. There is no record yet of any movement except from the inner prison to the outer prison. None ever would have been thought of if it had not been that there was a baptism in the transaction. Immediately after the washing of their stripes way." The washing of their stripes, and the baptism it is said, "and was baptized, he and all his straight-of the jailer, are both included in one sentence. I wish to call special attention to the word rendered "straight-way." The Greek word is "*parachrema*," and inasmuch as it is a very important word in this discussion, we

will hear what some of the Greek lexicons say about it. Liddell and Scott say that it means "on the spot." Groves says that it means "instantly." And Greenfield says it is equivalent to the English expression "on the spot." That settles the point beyond all reasonable controversy, that the instructions given to the jailer, the washing of the apostles' stripes, and the baptism of the jailer, "and all his," took place within the jail. In the twenty-sixth verse it is said that the foundations of the prison were shaken, . . . the doors were opened, and every one's bands were loosed" (*parachrema*) "on the spot." No one can claim, with any sort of face, that the prison was carried away, so that the doors might be opened. They were opened instantly, and *on the spot*. Now the same phraseology being used in speaking of the jailer and his baptism, absolutely requires that he should be baptized instantly, and on the spot. There is no evading the force of this conclusion. After the jailer was baptized, it is said that "he brought them into his house." This is the first movement indicated after they were brought out of the inner prison into the outer prison. The word rendered "brought" is *anagon*, and it means to lead, or bring from a lower to a higher place. Every movement made, in this whole transaction, by the jailer and the apostles is indicated by appropriate Greek words. And if there are no words indicating a movement, it is because no movement was made. Dr. J. M. Pendleton, in *Three Reasons Why I Am a Baptist* (p. 143), says that "they left the house when the baptism took place, and they went back into it after the baptism was over." That part of the history Luke failed to record. He knew nothing at all about it. Dr. Pendleton er-

roniously supposes that when the jailer took Paul and Silas and washed their stripes, that "he and all his" and the apostles left the jail and went off to find water, so that the jailer "and all his" could be immersed. But the Greek word rendered "took," *never* denotes movement from one place to another. Liddell and Scott say that it means, "to take possession of," and then "to take to one's self," as a wife, or an adopted son. In Matthew (i. 20) the angel said to Joseph, "Fear not to take (*paralabein*) unto thee Mary thy wife." Then in Matthew (ii. 14) is language still more expressive. "When he arose, he took (*parelabe*) the young child and his mother by night, and departed (*anechoresen*) into Egypt." He first took charge of the young child and his mother, preparatory to the journey, but they had not yet started. The Greek word is *parelabe*, and it is the same word that Dr. Pendleton used in carrying the jailer and his family and Paul and Silas out to where there was water, and then brought them back to the jail, but it never even started Joseph and his family on their journey. The inspired writer uses a word of quite a different meaning to carry them down to Egypt. The Greek word is *anechoresen*, and it means, to depart, or go away. There is not a shadow of proof that the jailer was baptized outside of the jail. It would be quite inconvenient, to say the least of it, for the jailer and his family to be marched out at the hour of midnight, through the city of Philippi, to find water deep enough for their immersion. But such matters as these are of no account with Dr. Carson. He says: "I will force water out of the word" (p. 414). Well, he can do that in the prison as well as he can out of it.

Now suppose we put a little common sense into the case, and view it from that standpoint. All of Macedonia, Philippi, and the prison in which Paul and Silas were confined, were subject to Roman authority. If the keeper of a Roman prison suffered the prisoners to escape, he himself was put to death. Sometime before the imprisonment of Paul and Silas, Peter had been put into prison by Herod, and after his escape Herod "examined the keepers," who had been stationed "before the door of the prison," and had them put to death. The Philippian jailer knew that he would meet the same fate if Paul and Silas had been gone. Now one of the most incredible of all things is to suppose that this jailer would have permitted Paul and Silas to take him and all his family, at the hour of midnight, from the jail and go out through the streets of the city of Philippi, and very likely beyond the city limits, to find water of sufficient depth to immerse him and his family. That jailer knew that the very minute that Paul and Silas stepped out of the jail his life was in jeopardy. But Dr. Carson cries out again, "The word *baptizo* demands it." It is strange that *baptizo* makes such imperious demands upon Carson and his brethren, and made none such upon the old Greeks. Origen, that old stalwart Greek, born A.D. 180, could stand and look with complacency at the water being poured out of pitchers upon Elijah's altar and call it baptism. Dr. Carson heard of this same baptism, and holding up his hands in holy horror, exclaims: "Every child knows that our word immerse may be used in the same way." (P. 394.) Dr. Carson, all through his book, occasionally makes his appeal to children, but whether they know that our

word immersion can be used in the sense of pouring or not is very doubtful. The next morning, after that ever memorable night that Paul and Silas had spent in the Philippian jail, the magistrates sent word to the keeper of the prison to let those men go; but when this message was delivered to Paul he refused to go out privately. He replied, "They have beaten us openly uncondemned, . . . and now do they thrust us out privily? Nay verily; but let them come themselves and fetch us out." Paul and Silas had been put into prison by the magistrates themselves, and now they refuse to go out unless the magistrates come and bring them out. But according to Dr. Pendleton's position, they had been out the night before, and the jailer and all his family with them. And then they had been out privately. Now here is a strange inconsistency. I can only explain it in one way, and that is, that Dr. Pendleton was mistaken. They never went out. How could the jailer account to the magistrates for his conduct the night before if they had all been out? Every word that Luke has used in writing the history of the case required that they should remain in the prison; and there is nothing under the shining sun, that requires them to leave the jail, except the theory of immersion. Paul was baptized in a private dwelling house, and "standing up" when it was done; so he would have no scruples in baptizing the jailer "and all his" while standing in the jail, even at the hour of midnight. But he did have scruples about going out of the jail, until the magistrates who had put him in there came themselves and brought him out.

THE BAPTISM OF CORNELIUS.

Rev. J. M. Pendleton says that "the objection to immersion," based upon the language used in this case, "is almost a laughable one" (Three Reasons, p. 142). Dr. Pendleton is like Dr. Carson, wherever he sees baptism, he sees immersion. The testimony of learned Greeks, as to the meaning of their own language, ought to be acceptable to immersionists, for they lay claim to them all. Let us hear Didymus, of Alexandria, a noted Greek. He says: "And the very image of baptism both continually illuminated and saved all Israel at that time, as Paul wrote" (1 Cor. x. 1, 2). This image of baptism was the passage of the children of Israel through the Red Sea. Dr. Pendleton is well pleased with this image. He says: "In the case of the Israelites it took the sea (which was as a wall on each side) and the cloud (which was above) to complete the envelopment." He also says he that does not see that this "means immerse is not to be reasoned with." Well, I must confess that I am one of that number. Let us examine this baptistery a little, which Dr. Pendleton has constructed. He says it took the sea as a wall on each side, and the cloud which was above, to complete the envelopment. Now if either one of the walls or the cloud above should be wanting, then there is no envelopment. There must be a complete surrounding, either in reality or in imagination, or else there is no immersion. The children of Israel

were ordered to "encamp by the sea." The Egyptians "overtook them encamping by the sea." And while they were thus encamped, "the pillar of the cloud went from before their face, and stood behind them." "It came between the camp of the Egyptians and the camp of Israel." "It was a cloud of darkness," to the Egyptians, "but it gave light" to the Israelites. When marching orders were given "the children of Israel went into the midst of the sea upon the dry ground; and the waters were a wall unto them on their right hand and on their left" (Ex. xiv. 22). Now where is the cloud that constituted the top of this baptistery? It was not above the Israelites in their passage through the Red Sea. It was between them and the Egyptians. The cloud which Dr. Pendleton says it took "to complete the envelopment" was not there. Consequently, from his own premise, there is no immersion.

But Didymus has something more to say: "And as prophesied by Ezekiel, 'I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and you shall be clean from all your sins.'" Now Didymus says that this language from Ezekiel is the "very image of baptism." An image is like the thing it represents. I stand before a looking-glass, and see "the very image" of my face. Didymus saw in the sprinkling of Ezekiel, "the very image of baptism." If this old Greek is correct in the use of his own language, then Ezekiel's sprinkling is just like baptism. The man that cannot see that this is baptism by sprinkling, "is not to be reasoned with."

Now from all of these facts, if we choose to do so, we can baptize Cornelius in his own house by sprinkling. It is in proof that Peter and those with him "entered into the man's house," and it is *not in proof*, that they

ever left the house until after the baptism was performed. Peter preached and Cornelius and his friends were converted. He says: "As I began to speak, the Holy Ghost fell on them, as on us at the beginning. Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost" (Acts xi. 15, 16). It is a matter of record that the baptism of the Holy Ghost is by pouring, and we can see no reason why the baptism of water should not be performed in like manner. But Peter says: "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost, as well as we?" The word rendered "forbid," is *kolusai*, and it means, to hinder, to withhold, or to keep back.

One of two things in this case is an absolute certainty; either the persons that were to be baptized had to be taken to the water, or the water had to be brought to them. There is not in the whole transaction the least intimation that Peter and those with him left the house. So those who believe that they did leave the house, must believe without evidence. The language is, "Can any man forbid, or keep back water?" This is that which almost made Dr. Pendleton laugh. The idea of forbidding water to be brought.

In Matthew (xix. 14) we have an account of little children that were brought to the Savior that he might bless them, but the "disciples rebuked them." "But Jesus said, Suffer the little children, and forbid (*koluete*) them not to come unto me." Now these little children were being brought to the Savior. They were not coming of their own accord. And when there was an objection made to it, Jesus said forbid (*koluete*)

them not. The same Greek word is used here that is used by Peter. Jesus says do not "hinder" or "keep them back" from being brought. The command of Christ was to his disciples, but the effect of the command was upon the "little children." These two cases are so near alike, in phraseology, that they teach the same doctrine. In one case Christ would not forbid (*koluete*), "keep back" or "hinder," little children from being brought. In the other case Peter would not forbid (*kolusai*), "keep back" or "hinder" water from being brought. There is nothing in the baptism of Cornelius that required Peter and those with him and Cornelius with his household, to leave the place where they were converted, except the immersion theory, which at that time did not exist. In this case Peter states the fact very distinctly, that "we entered into the man's house," but no one makes even an intimation that they went out of the house for the purpose of baptizing Cornelius and his friends.

In the account of Paul's baptism it is stated that Ananias "entered into the house," but not one word about going out. Ananias tells Paul why he had come, and that God had sent him, but all that Ananias did was done in the house. The same is true of the jailer. Not one word is said about going out to find water. Immersionists claim all of these cases, and yet they cannot put a finger upon one word which shows that the converts left the place where they were converted for the purpose of being immersed. Athanasius, that venerable old Greek and patriarch of Alexandria, speaks of a "baptism through tears." Cornelius could be baptized in his own house, as the record shows that he was, and such old Greeks as Clement, of Alexandria,

and Origen, and Gregory Nazianzen, would all acknowledge that it was valid baptism. It was Clement who said of a young man that was reclaimed by the Apostle John, that he was baptized a second time with his own tears. There is an impassable gulf between the writings of Dr. Carson and the writings of these old Greeks, on the mode of baptism.

THE BAPTISM OF THE EUNUCH.

Dr. Carson lays imperious claim to this case, and warns all intruders that it is "holy ground." He says: "This case, however, has, in the Divine wisdom, been recorded to confound obstinacy" (Carson on Baptism, p. 337). The record of this baptism is in Acts viii. 38, 39, "And they went down both into (*eis*) the water, both Philip and the eunuch, and he baptized him. And when they were come up out of (*ek*) the water, the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip, that the eunuch saw him no more." It is not said in this account that there was much water; but that they came to some water. There was enough for the baptizing of the eunuch, but whether there was enough for his immersion, or not, is quite another question. We have now upon record a sufficiency of proof to show that he could have been baptized without going into the water at all. But Dr. Carson lays great stress upon the two prepositions, *eis*, which is rendered "into," and *ek*, which is rendered "out of." But *eis* does not always mean into. Liddell and Scott say that in the New Testament "it is used to express the point arrived at." That would put Philip and the eunuch at the water, but not in it. Dr. Carson says: "I admit that *eis* means unto as well as into" (page 355). On the same page he says: "*Epi* is the preposition that gives them their station at the water." If that is true they are at the water's edge. But in the thirty-sixth verse it

is said: "As they went on their way they came (*en*) unto a certain water." Then "the eunuch said, See here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptized?" They are yet in the chariot, and the chariot still moving on. Then after some more instructions, "He commanded the chariot to stand still." Up to this point they were both in the chariot, and not "at the water." Then they both (*katebesan eis*) went down to the water. *Epi* never did give "them their station at the water." It never took them out of the chariot. In 2 Kings vi. 4, it is said Elisha went with the sons of the prophets, "and when they came (*eis*) to Jordan, they cut down wood." Now they were not in the water of the Jordan cutting wood, but at the edge of it, and so near that one man's axe fell into the water. It requires more proof than the single preposition *eis* to put Philip and the eunuch into the water. Take another example: "Go thou to (*eis*) the sea, and cast a hook" (Matt. xvii. 27). The disciples were not ordered to go into the sea, but to cast a hook into the sea, while they stood at the water's edge. Take an example in the twenty-fifth verse of the same chapter: "And when he was come into (*eiselthen eis*) the house." The single preposition *eis* put the disciples to the sea, but not into it. The preposition *eis* repeated, once with the verb, and once alone (*eiselthen eis*) put Jesus "into the house." In Acts (xiv. 1) is a passage that throws light upon the case in hand: "And it came to pass in Iconium, that they went both together into (*eiselthein eis*) the synagogue." And both Philip and the eunuch "went down to (*eis*) the water." In the former case the *eis* repeated put Paul and Barnabas into the synagogue, and in the other case the *eis* not repeated put Philip

and the eunuch to the water. Then in Acts (iii. 1) "Peter and John went up together (*eis*) to the temple," but they did not enter; and there they healed the lame man. "And he leaping up stood, and walked, and entered with them into (*eiselthe eis*) the temple." These texts are very expressive.

But in the case of Philip and the eunuch, Dr. Carson relies more upon the preposition *ek*, rendered out of, than he does upon *eis*. He says: "It never in a single instance designates merely from; it is always out of" (p. 355). I propose now to severely test the truth of this statement. When Joseph had laid the body of Jesus in "his own new tomb," he "rolled a great stone to the door of the sepulcher." Mark says: "And he rolled a stone unto the door of the sepulcher." No one can say that the stone was in the sepulcher. It was rolled to the door of the sepulcher. In John (xx. 1) it is said that Mary cometh "unto (*eis*) the sepulcher, and seeth the stone taken away (*ek*) from the sepulcher." Now Mary came (*eis*) to the sepulcher, but not into it, and she saw the stone taken away (*ek*) from the sepulcher, but not out of it. Mark records the same transaction in these words: "Who shall roll us away the stone (*ek*) from the door of the sepulcher?" In 2 Tim. iv. 17, Paul says: "I was delivered (*ek*) from the mouth of the lion." Paul had never been in the mouth of the lion. He had been on trial before Nero, but was set at liberty, and escaped the danger of the mouth of the lion. We have three examples here, taken from the New Testament, which clearly contradict Dr. Carson's statement. We will now give some examples from another source. Thucydides says of a promontory that it "was steep from

(*ek*) the sea, and not easily attacked from (*ek*) the land." This writer could only be understood as directing the attention of his readers to that part of the promontory that was visible. That is, from the surface of the sea upwards. The attack must be from the surface of the land, and not out of it. Dr. Ryland gives another example. This is from the Periegesis of Dionysius. He says: "From (*ek*) the Sicilian mountains the sea extended far to the east." I see no possible chance to torture *ek*, in this quotation so as to make it mean out of. One more: "Rising from (*ek*) her seat." This woman did not rise out of her seat, she rose from it. Dr. Ryland gives several other examples; and Dr. Carson, after putting them all to the rack, and evidently feeling that he had failed to explain them, even to his own satisfaction, says: "I observe, however, that *in some way* the idea of out of must be implied, because *ek* is used" (Carson on Baptism, p. 140). That is an admission that the quotations themselves do not state any such fact. And then he takes for granted the very thing that is to be proven. They *must* mean out of, "because *ek* is used." We give two examples from the Septuagint: "And they departed from (*ek*) the mount (Sinai) of the Lord three days' journey" (Num. x. 33). "And they journeyed from (*ek*) mount Hor by way of the Red Sea" (Num. xxi. 4). In these cases the children of Israel were encamped in the valleys at the foot of the mountains. They were not even on top of the mountains, much less in them. The examples which have now been given establish the fact that Dr. Carson was mistaken when he said that *ek* "never in a single instance designates merely from; it is always *out of*." We have

now seen that *eis* did not necessarily put Philip and the eunuch into the water, nor that *ek*, of necessity, took them out. It is a rule in the Greek Testament and Septuagint with but few exceptions, when a person passes from one place into another, that fact is expressed by a repetition of the preposition *eis*. Once with the verb, and once alone. In Mark (xi. 15) it is said: "And Jesus went into (*eiselthon eis*) the temple." Another example is in the twentieth chapter of John: "And the other disciple did outrun Peter and came first to (*elthe protos eis*) the sepulcher. And he stooping down . . . saw the linen clothes lying; yet went he not in" (*eiselthen*). Now it is stated plainly that this disciple came (*elthe eis*) to the sepulcher but did not go in. "Then cometh Simon Peter following him, and went into (*eiselthen eis*) the sepulcher." No one can fail to see, in these examples, the difference between John coming (*elthe eis*) to the sepulcher, and Peter who went (*eiselthen eis*) into the sepulcher. The preposition in the case of Philip and the eunuch is not repeated: "And they went down both to (*eis*) the water." If it was necessary that it should be repeated, in order to put Peter and John into the sepulcher, then it was certainly as necessary that it should be repeated in order to put Philip and the eunuch into the water.

One *eis* put Peter and John to the sepulcher, but not into it, and one *eis* put Philip and the eunuch to the water, but not into it. In Acts (ix. 6) the Lord said to Saul of Tarsus, "Arise and go into (*eiselthe eis*) the city." Then in the eighth verse it is said they "brought him into (*eisegagon eis*) Damascus." In Mark (iii. 1) "And he entered into (*eiselthe eis*) the

synagogue." Acts xi. 12: "And we entered into (*eiselthomen eis*) the man's house." These are only a few of the many examples that could be given. I will give only two from the Septuagint. Deut. vi. 10: "And when the Lord thy God shall bring thee (*eisagage eis*) into the land." Deut. viii. 7: "For the Lord thy God shall bring thee (*eisaxei eis*) into a good land." The examples of this kind that I could give would fill several pages of my book. Dr. Carson claims that the prepositions all favor his theory. Now if this were the case, why is it that the preposition *eis* is not repeated in one single instance of baptisms performed at the Jordan, or anywhere else? If Philip and the eunuch went into the water, then I can give no answer to the question, nor explanation as to why the preposition *eis* is not repeated.

I wish to make some quotations from "Letters on Baptism," written by Rev. Edmund B. Fairfield, D.D. But who is Rev. Edmund B. Fairfield, D.D.? I will let him answer the question. In writing to a friend he says: "You know, perhaps, that I have been a Baptist for more than a quarter of a century, and no man was more certain of being right. I had not a doubt on the subject. How this change came about may be told in a few words. Some years ago I was requested by a Baptist publishing house to prepare a book in defense of Baptist views. [In a foot note on page 12, it is said that this was the "Free Baptist Printing Establishment, now on Shawmut Avenue, Boston."] They proposed a volume of about four hundred duodecimo pages. I accepted this appointment with the fullest assurance that an argument could be made in that compass that nobody could fairly

answer. In order to do it I determined to go over the whole ground from the beginning; so that when the work was finished the honest and intelligent reader of my book would be constrained to admit that it was unassailable. I fully believed that immersion was the only water baptism, and that it could be made so to appear to every candid inquirer. My disappointment you can imagine when I tell you that, as I prosecuted my study of the subject, I found tower after tower of my Baptist fort tumbling down. Most laboriously did I strive to repair them. Month after month for more than two years did I labor to maintain my old ground, but to no avail. There were too many hard and solid facts against me. Having studied the subject through and through on both sides, I was convinced of my error. *Immersion was not the only baptism.* The word *baptizo* did not mean immerse in the New Testament. I saw it clearly" (Letters on Baptism, pp. 12, 13, 14). These are the facts I want before the reader.

Dr. Fairfield says: "There is one unequivocal method of saying that a man went into the water, or into his house, or into a city, and that is to use a verb compounded with the preposition *eis* as a prefix, either alone or followed by the preposition" (Letters on Baptism, p. 156). Then on page 157 he says: "Now what I wish to add is this: That this only unequivocal method of expressing the idea of going into is never used in speaking of going into the water for baptism." Now this is the point to which I had conducted the mind of the reader before I ever saw this book, and I am truly glad to have the concurrence of this Greek scholar.

But Dr. Carson relies with more implicit confidence upon the preposition *ek*, than he does upon *eis*. He says it never in a single instance means merely from, it is always out of. But I have given a number of examples which absolutely disprove his assertion. We find that as it is necessary for *eis* to be repeated as a rule, to put a person on the inside of a house, or any other place with fixed limits; so it is necessary as a rule, for *ek* to be repeated in order to bring him out.

In Matthew (xv. 11) we have an example of both prepositions: "Not that which goeth into (*eiserchomenon eis*) the mouth defileth a man, but that which cometh out of (*ekporeuomenon ek*) the mouth, this defileth a man."

In Acts (xvi. 40) we have another example of the same kind: "And they went out of (*exellhontes ek*) the prison, and entered into (*eiselthon eis*) the house of Lydia." These two examples both tend to the establishment of our position in regard to *eis* as well as *ek*. We read in Mark (v. 8): "And he said unto him, Come out of (*exelthe ek*) the man." Luke iv. 22: They "wondered at the gracious words which proceeded out of (*ekponeuomencis ek*) his mouth." John ii. 15: "He drove them all out of (*exebalen ek*) the temple." We see that in all of these examples it was necessary that *ek* should be repeated to give the meaning of the text, but it was not necessary that it should be repeated in the case of Philip and the eunuch. Ex. xii. 41: And "it came to pass that all the hosts of the Lord went out of (*exelthe ek*) the land of Egypt." Josh. x. 23: "And brought those five kings unto him out of (*exegagosan ek*) the cave."

The examples which I have now given are sufficient to settle the point, that it is not even probable that Philip and the eunuch went into the water, or came out of the water. Dr. Fairfield says in "Letters on Baptism" (page 163): "There is no case where this unequivocal manner of saying that one goes 'out of' a place is found in connection with baptism. We are compelled, therefore, to the conclusion that there is no certain evidence in the New Testament that any one either went into the water or came out of it in connection with baptism." There is not one single instance of a baptism recorded in the Greek New Testament, in which the language used required the parties to go into the water, or to come out of the water. The baptism of the eunuch is the strongest case, and we have proven beyond a question, that the Greek required no more of the parties than to go to the water, and to come from the water. Dr. Fairfield says, (page 158): "If it be true that the eunuch was baptized by immersion, it is not because it is so recorded." The baptism of the eunuch was Dr. Carson's crucial case. By it the cause of immersion was to be made so plain that there could be no appeal from it. He says it has "in the Divine wisdom, been recorded to confound obstinacy." This is one of those cases that if the angel Gabriel were to hesitate to receive his interpretation of it, that would be sufficient ground to "order him to school." It was necessary in the examination of this case to be critical. 1. Because in this way only could all the points be brought out. 2. Because it is Dr. Carson's strongest case. When we show that immersion fails here, we show that it fails everywhere else. We rely with implicit confidence upon the Greek

text, in this case of baptism, and that does not say that the eunuch either "went into" the water, or that he "came out of" the water. But in contrasting this, with other parts of the Greek Testament, we come deliberately to the conclusion that he was not immersed at all. Inasmuch as he was reading in a scroll of Isaiah's prophecy, in which the prophet was speaking of a Savior to come, and Philip began at the same Scripture and preached unto him Jesus, and in that same scroll the prophet said, "So shall he sprinkle many nations," therefore it is much more probable that he was baptized by sprinkling than by immersion.

ROMANS VI. 3, 4.

Dr. Carson claims that he has in this chapter an argument for immersion, that baffles the skill of all his opponents. He seems to think that the expression "buried by baptism" is so strong in favor of immersion that no one but a fanatic would controvert it. Yet some of his own brethren never could see the argument in it that he could see. He says: "Some Baptists, it seems, do not perceive the force of the argument which others ground on this passage" (Carson on Baptism, p. 420). He says, on the same page, it is "an argument, however, which I would hold were an angel to reject it." Were it not that "baptism" is used in these verses, there would be no trouble with Dr. Carson, nor any one else, in giving to it all a spiritual application. Every word used in this passage of Scripture must, of necessity, be understood in a spiritual sense, unless it is baptism. But inasmuch as Paul elsewhere teaches the doctrine of a spiritual baptism, I see no reason why this should not be.

Let us now analyze the text and see what we can make of it. Paul says in the second verse: "How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?" Paul and those to whom he wrote were not literally dead. Their bodies were not dead, but living; but then there is a sense in which they were dead. He says: "We are dead to sin." What is it that is dead to sin? If it was not the physical man, then it must

be the spiritual man. That does not mean that the soul ceases to live, but that it is dead to the love and practice of sin. Paul said to the Colossians, "Set your affection on things above, not on things on the earth; for ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God" (Col. iii. 2, 3). If there is a death there must be a corresponding burial. We have seen that it is not the physical man that is dead, but in one sense the spiritual man. Paul says: "Therefore we are buried with him by (*tau baptismatos*) the baptism into death." In this case, and in (Col. ii. 12) the article is used in the Greek with the noun, which shows that it is a special, and not ordinary baptism. John's baptism was a special baptism, consequently the article is used in the Greek with the noun. As in (Matt. xxi. 25), "The baptism (*to baptisma*) of John." The same is true of Christ's baptism of suffering (Mark x. 39). He says: "And with the baptism (*to baptisma*) that I am baptized withal shall ye be baptized." Then when we come to ordinary water baptism, as in 1 Peter (iii. 21), it is (*baptisma*) without the article. Now those who are said in the second verse to be dead, are the same persons that are said, in the fourth verse, to be buried. Paul says "we" are dead, and "we" are buried. Then it is the spiritual man that is buried, and not the body. How is this burial effected? And what is the agent that performs the burial? He says: "We are buried by the baptism." The baptism then is the agent. The immersionist takes his subject and dips him into water, and calls that a burial; but this is not that kind. This is "buried by the baptism into death." Paul says: "We are dead to sin." We have it then plainly stated that it is a death to sin, and

that we are put into that death by the baptism. Is it possible that water baptism brings about the soul's death to sin and life to righteousness? Christ said: "That which is born of the Spirit is spirit" (John iii. 6). Paul said: "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free, and have been all made to drink into one Spirit" (1 Cor. xii. 13). This is the baptism that frees the soul from sin, and brings it into communion with God. It is the baptism in which the soul dies to sin, and "walks in newness of life." It is Holy Ghost baptism, and not water baptism. It is said in Colossians: "For ye are dead and your life is hid with Christ in God." How long will the regenerated soul be hid with Christ in God? Just as long as it is "dead to sin." It is said that we are buried by the baptism into death. How long will this burial continue? Just as long as the death to sin continues. Christ's body was buried as long as it was dead. A man's body dies and is buried in the grave, and we say it will remain buried until the resurrection. The burial is a continuous state. It is said that "we are dead to sin." This is a continuous death. It is also said that "we are buried." This is a continuous burial. Dr. Carson says: "The baptism here must be literal, because in no other is there a burial (Carson on Baptism, p. 423). But how can a dipping be a burial? He says: "Baptizo always signifies to dip" (p. 55). He would take a man to the water, and dip him into the water, and raise him up again as quick as possible. Is that a burial? Webster says that the water transaction is to dip in water "for a moment." If a man were put into the ground, and then taken out "in a

moment," would that be a burial in any proper sense of the term? No one could say that it would. Then where is there any degree of comparison between a dipping and a burial? The dipping is a momentary action, but the burial is a continuous state. It is nowhere said that we are buried in water, but that "we are buried by the baptism into death."

We will notice briefly the third verse: "Know yet not, that so many of us as are [marginal reading] baptized into Jesus Christ, are baptized into his death?" We have already considered the question of "baptism into death." Is it water baptism or spiritual baptism that puts the soul of man into a saving connection with Jesus Christ? Dr. Carson says: "It is not in baptism, nor by means of baptism, that we die with Christ really, or are made spiritually alive" (Carson on Baptism, p. 161). Then Dr. Carson is speaking of one kind of baptism, and Paul is speaking of another kind. Paul says: "We are baptized into Jesus Christ." That certainly puts the baptized man into spiritual connection with Christ, and makes the soul "spiritually alive." He says again: "If any man be in Christ he is a new creature" (2 Cor. v. 17). The man that is in Christ, and a new creature, must be "spiritually alive." And as Dr. Carson says, it is not water baptism by which this work is done, it must be the baptism of the Holy Spirit. We read: "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, . . . and have been all made to drink into one Spirit." In that we have spiritual connection, and spiritual life, and spiritual communion with Christ. "By one Spirit we are all baptized into one body," and by the same Spirit we are "baptized into Christ Jesus." Then according to Dr. Carson's

own teaching, and Paul agreeing thereto, water baptism is left out of the question.

Col. ii. 11, 12, is another passage of Scripture that Dr. Carson claims by right of inheritance. The comments that we made upon Romans vi. 3, 4, are applicable in this case. In Col. ii. 11, it is said: "In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands." This is not literal circumcision, but spiritual. It is "made without hands." And this circumcision is effectual "in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh." This is the "circumcision that is of the heart" (Rom. ii. 29). The teaching of this verse relates entirely to the spiritual man. Then the twelfth verse applies to the same person and can apply to no others. The ones that are "circumcised without hands," are the same ones that are "buried in baptism." In the eleventh verse it is the spiritual nature of man that is circumcised, and in the twelfth verse it is the spiritual nature of man that is baptized. This is the circumcision that is "in the spirit and not in the letter" (Rom. ii. 29). "For we are the circumcision which worshiped God in the spirit" (Phil. iii. 3). This is a continuous state of circumcision, and the baptism, of the twelfth verse, is a continuous state of baptism. The one is exactly equal to the other in point of duration. This is not literal water baptism, but spiritual baptism. "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body." How it is that *baptizo* means nothing else but dip, and all other meanings "necessarily excluded," and baptism means a burial, which is a continuous state, is a problem which has never yet been explained. Dr. Carson uses quite a profusion of sarcasm upon any writer who says that *baptizo* may be

used in the sense of sprinkling in one instance, and in the sense of pouring in another. He says it cannot mean both, but he can use it in the sense of dip, and then in the sense of burial, two words which are as far apart in meaning as omega is from alpha, without ever wincing a muscle. I will make a quotation from Dr. Newman, a Baptist historian, as quoted by Dr. Lofton, in "English Baptist Reformation" (p. 50). He says: "The use of the biblical language about burial and resurrection in connection with baptism proves absolutely nothing as to the practice of a writer." Then on the same page he makes a quotation from Edmond Jessop, a work bearing date A.D. 1623. In commenting upon Col. ii. 12, Mr. Jessop says: "In which words (I say) he settled down expressly, that the baptism which saveth, the baptism whereby we put on Christ, the baptism whereby our hearts are purged and sanctified, and the sins of our flesh done away, whereby we are buried with Christ and do rise with him, even that which is through faith and operation of the Spirit, is one and the same, with the circumcision of the heart." That Mr. Jessop speaks of the baptism of the Holy Spirit in this quotation cannot be doubted; and he says it "is one and the same with the circumcision of the heart." It is a matter of fact, also, that the church, at that time baptized by affusion. Then Dr. Lofton, on page 51, quotes from the Puritan Catechism, A.D. 1644, "when it asks the question: 'How are we buried by baptism with Christ?' and answers it as follows: 'When he was buried by baptism, sweating water and blood, he was buried by baptism, being under the wrath of the Father all his woes were over him, then were the elect buried with him in

his death, when many came aforehand to bury him, in being manifested to believers when they are baptized by the Spirit, dying unto sin, and rising unto newness of life.'” The Puritans baptized by pouring and sprinkling, and “this Catechism is defending sprinkling as the mode of baptism against immersion,” and yet it uses the same language that Dr. Carson thinks proves immersion beyond a doubt. I have now given an exposition of Rom. vi. 3, 4, and Col. ii. 11, 12, which seems to me to be perfectly clear and legitimate, and in which all the parts harmonize. And this exposition is sustained by old writers, dating back to A.D. 1644, and some to A.D. 1623. Some modern writers, and not a few modern preachers, seeing the expression, “buried by baptism,” take it for granted that that is immersion, and never analyze the language to see what it does teach. Dr. Lofton says (p. 51): “The Menonites, Smyth, Helwys, and Morton, abound in the expressions, ‘believe and be baptized,’ ‘put on Christ in baptism,’ ‘buried and risen with him in baptism,’ and yet they in no way differed from the sprinkling Puritans in usage or practice.” There is nothing in the Bible, nor in the history of baptism, as held by those ancient people, that sustains Dr. Carson in his theory of immersion.

SPIRITUAL BAPTISM.

The doctrine of spiritual baptism is clearly taught in the New Testament. In this baptism the Holy Spirit of God comes into immediate contact with the spirit or soul of man. The Savior said: “That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit” (John iii. 6). The doctrine of this text

is so plain that comment could make it no plainer. John the Baptist said to the people: "I indeed have baptized you with water, but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost" (Mark i. 8). It is the plain teaching of God's inspired truth that the falling of the Holy Ghost upon the people is called baptism, as the following Scripture shows. In Acts (xi. 15, 16) Peter says: "And as I began to speak, the Holy Ghost fell on them, as on us at the beginning. Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost." We have here John's baptism, and the baptism of the Holy Ghost presented in the same verse. And Peter says "the Holy Ghost fell on them," and that that was being "baptized with the Holy Ghost." John could have baptized the same way as to mode, and it would have been as truly baptism. In Acts (i. 4, 5) we have some of the last words of the Savior to his apostles. They were not to "depart from Jerusalem," but were to "wait for the promise of the Father." "For John truly baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost, not many days hence." And in Acts (ii. 4). it is said, "They were all filled with the Holy Ghost." And when they began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance, the people said they were "full of new wine." But Peter said: "These are not drunken, as ye suppose. . . . But this is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel; And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh, and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy" (verses 15, 16, 17). The apostles were thus prepared for their great work.

Dr. Carson disposes of baptism by the Holy Spirit after a style of his own. On this subject he says it is a "blasphemous perversion of the language in question, to suppose that it imports a real pouring out of the Spirit" (Carson on Baptism, p. 106). But still he says: "On the day of Pentecost there was a real baptism in the emblems of the Spirit;" and "the disciples were immersed into the Holy Spirit by the abundance of his gifts;" and finally, "they were literally covered with the appearance of wind and fire" (Carson, p. 107). We have in these few lines three baptisms. 1. A real baptism, not in the Spirit, but "in the emblems." 2. An immersion into the Spirit, "by the abundance of his gifts." 3. Another baptism by being "literally covered with the appearance of wind and fire." This last one must be only the appearance of a baptism, as there was neither wind nor fire in the transaction. There was "a sound . . . as of a rushing mighty wind," and "cloven tongues, like as of fire," but no wind and no fire. Then on page 110 he says: "The wind descended to fill the house, that when the house was filled with the wind the disciples might be baptized in it. Their baptism consisted in being totally surrounded with the wind." Inasmuch as there was no wind in the case, and there was a sound that "filled the house," we have a fourth baptism in "sound." Then on page 109 he says: "They who were baptized on that day (Pentecost) in wind and fire, had been baptized before." On pages 112, 113 he says: "The pouring is not the baptism, though the Spirit was poured out, that they might be baptized in it. The descent and the pouring are over before the baptism takes place." Here he represents the Spirit as form-

ing a baptistery and the disciples being "baptized in it." Who was the administrator? The word of the Lord, in speaking of this very transaction, reads, "I will pour out of my Spirit upon (*epi*) all flesh" (Acts ii. 17). He has yet another kind of baptism (p. 111). He says: "The fire sat down upon each of them. The baptism did not consist . . . in the sitting down, or the mode of the coming of the flame, but in their being under it." He has now got the fire kindled into a flame—actually burning, and the people under it. But he continues: "They were surrounded by the wind, and covered by the fire above." His baptistery is now complete. Then he says: "They were therefore buried in wind and fire." Now inasmuch as there was no wind nor fire, much less a flame of fire, on the day of Pentecost, then there was no burial. Dr. Carson's whole theory, in this case, is fabricated upon "sound," for as to wind there was none. After all of Dr. Carson's manufactured "wind and fire," the case is plainly stated by Christ himself: "Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence" (Acts i. 5). And when this was fulfilled on the day of Pentecost, it is said: "And on (*epi*) my servants, and on (*epi*) my handmaidens I will pour out, in those days, of my Spirit, and they shall prophesy" (Acts ii. 18). Although Dr. Carson (p. 105) says "it is blasphemy to attempt a representation" of the pouring out of the Holy Spirit, yet regardless of his theory the Holy Spirit is poured out. In Ezekiel (xxxix. 29) it is said: "I have poured out my Spirit upon the house of Israel, saith the Lord." Let us consider the oneness or the unity of the church. In Ephesians (iv. 4, 5, 6) it is said: "There is one body, and one Spirit; . . . one Lord,

one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all." Then in chap. i. 22, 23, it is said: "And hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be head over all things to the church, which is his body." Now the point is made very clear that the "one body" is the "one church," and that that church is the spiritual invisible kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ. Every truly regenerated soul is a member of that one church, and no others are or can be. "And the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved" (Acts ii. 47). Albert Barnes, in commenting upon this verse, says: "It was the Lord who did this. There was no power in man to do it." Men can add members to the visible church, but not to the invisible or spiritual church. There is not only "one body, but one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling." There is not only one Lord, but "one faith," the kind of faith that instrumentally saves one saves all. "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus" (Gal. iii. 16). "Being justified by faith we have peace with God." There is not only one faith but one baptism. Paul in Hebrews (ix. 10) speaks of different kinds of baptisms, and in ch. vi. 2, of "the doctrine of baptisms," but these baptisms refer back to Old Testament times. But how many baptisms are there holding connection with the church of Jesus Christ under the New Testament dispensation? Paul tells the Ephesians that there is only one. Now bear in mind that "there is one body, and one Spirit," and "one hope," "one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all." Paul has something to say to the Corinthians on this subject. "Now ye are the body of Christ and members in particular" (1 Cor.

xii. 27). The question now to be settled, and settled forever, is, How do we become members of that one body? Paul will give us the answer. "For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many; are one body, so also is Christ. For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free, and have been all made to drink into one Spirit" (1 Cor. xii. 12, 13). There is no salvation outside of the spiritual kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ, and we are members of that kingdom by the baptism of the Holy Ghost. Paul says to the Galatians (iii. 27): "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." It is only by spiritual baptism that the soul is put into saving connection with Christ. To be baptized in the name of Christ, or in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, is a very different thing from being baptized into Christ. "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body," and Christ is "head over all things to the church, which is his body" (Eph. i. 22, 23).

Now we have found the one body, the one church, and the one Spirit by which we are baptized into that body. Well, says one, What use have you for water baptism? It has a place. There is a visible church as well as an invisible one, and there is a visible baptism as well as an invisible baptism. We want an outward sign or emblem of the inward or spiritual baptism. It is said that "faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness" (Rom. iv. 9). He became a pious man, and it was necessary that there should be an outward sign to represent the work of grace in the heart. Outward circumcision was signifi-

cant only when it pointed to that "circumcision which was of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter" (Rom. ii. 29).

Then in Rom. iv. 11, it is said: "And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised." As the real circumcision of the heart was the actual cutting off and separation of sin from the heart, so outward circumcision "in the flesh," was a sign of that inward circumcision "in the spirit." Now in like manner we have, in the New Testament dispensation, the baptism of the Holy Spirit which effects the same thing that spiritual circumcision did under the Old Testament dispensation. In Titus (iii. 5,6) we read: "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Savior." The Revised Version and the Baptist Version both render this sixth verse: "Which he poured out upon us richly." This is also the literal rendering of the Greek. In this scripture we have the real application of God's Holy Spirit to the soul of man, and it is called the "renewing of the Holy Ghost." "which he poured out upon us." In Rom. xv. 16, it is written, "that the offering up of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost." And John said: "Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost" (Acts i. 5). "And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh." The pouring out of the Holy Spirit upon the souls of men is real, not imaginary, and God's holy word calls it baptism. Now we want an outward sign, or emblem,

that fitly represents Holy Spirit baptism. Let us keep in mind that the sign is not the reality. The shadow is not the tree, nor is the tree the shadow, but the form of the shadow is like the form of the tree. There are two monumental institutions in the church, the sacrament of the Lord's Supper and the sacrament of baptism. Bread and wine are chosen as fit emblems to represent the body and blood of our blessed Savior. "And he took bread, . . . and brake it, . . . saying this is my body" (Luke xxii. 19). It was not his real body, but it was the emblem he had chosen to represent his body. He calls the emblem by the name of the thing it represents "this is my body." Disconnect the bread from the sacramental supper and it is not his body in any sense. The bread broken and used in this monumental institution, has been the only proper emblem of his broken body for more than eighteen hundred years. Nothing else could be so used. And he took the cup and said: "This is my blood," the "fruit of the vine." It is not his real blood, but it was the thing he had chosen to represent his blood, even in figure, only when used as he directed. "This do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come" (1 Cor. xi. 25, 26). The proper use of bread and wine, in the proper administration of this sacrament, "shows the Lord's death till he comes." Bread and wine may be used in many ways, but they are never emblems of the mangled body and spilt blood of our Lord Jesus Christ only when used in this sacrament. This sacred sacrament has never, in all the ages past, lost its sweet

spiritual significance to the devout Christian. He still reads the blessed word: "This is my blood which is shed for you." These emblems within themselves are of no intrinsic value to the Christian. It is only that which they represent that is of value.

The other sacrament that holds connection with the church is water baptism. We have seen that Christ is "head over all things to the church, which is his body;" and that there is one Spirit and one baptism, and that "by one Spirit we are all baptized into one body." But this is not the visible church. Holy Spirit baptism never introduces any one into the visible church, nor does water baptism ever introduce any one into the invisible church. Things that are not the same should not be confounded. The visible church at most, can only be an imitation of the invisible church. The spiritual kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, which is the invisible church, is the reality, and the visible church is the outward form. Every member of the spiritual church of Jesus Christ, was made so by the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Saving faith, by which he was justified, was his own act, but the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost, by which he was made a new creature, was a divine act. It is in place just here to give an expression in regard to infants who die in infancy. We believe that all infants dying in infancy are saved, and that they are saved through the atoning merits of our Lord Jesus Christ. This is the doctrine of our church. By what process are they saved? They must have a saving connection, personally, with the blessed Savior. They must be introduced into the spiritual kingdom of

Christ, for outside of this there is no salvation to infants, idiots, or adults. They are not capable of exercising saving faith. They must be saved wholly upon sovereign principles. The Holy Spirit takes them just where he takes the adult after he has exercised saving faith in Christ, cleanses and regenerates their spiritual natures, and by one Spirit they are baptized into one body, the same as adults. Men may oppose infant baptism ever so much, but infants dying in infancy are baptized by the Holy Spirit in spite of all opposition. They must have the saving baptism, whether they ever receive water baptism or not.

Water baptism holds connection with the visible church, and not the invisible, and spritual baptism holds connection with the invisible church, and not the visible. Spiritual baptism is real and of intrinsic worth, and water baptism is the emblem. The emblem is nothing without the reality. Jesus said: "John truly baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence" (Acts i. 5).

In what mode is the Holy Spirit applied to men? The Bible is very specific upon that point. The mode of the reality will settle the mode of the emblem. We read in Prov. i. 23, "Turn ye at my reproof, behold I will pour out my Spirit unto you, I will make known my words unto you." There can be no mistake in the meaning of this text. Then it is God's own truth, and he intended for us to understand it just as it is written. In Isa. xlv. 3, we read: "For I will pour water upon him that is thirsty, and floods upon the dry ground: I will pour my Spirit upon thy seed, and my blessing upon thine offspring." Isaiah is divinely in-

118 THE MODE OF CHRISTIAN BAPTISM.

spired, and writes God's holy truth from his own lips. "I will pour my Spirit." That is the way, that is the mode, and that is the word of God. In the prophecy of Joel (ii. 28) it is said: "And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh." This prophecy stood for eight hundred years before it was fulfilled. Then on the day of Pentecost, when the Holy Ghost was poured out upon the people, Peter says: "This is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel." "And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh." Just ten days before this outpouring of the Holy Spirit, the Savior told the disciples that they should "be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." The prophecy is fulfilled, the Holy Spirit is poured out, and the Savior said it was baptism. In the apostolic age there were "diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit." "For to one is given by the Spirit the gifts of healing, to another the working of miracles, to another prophecy, to another discerning of spirits, to another divers kinds of tongues, to another the interpretation of tongues" (1 Cor. xii. 10). These are some of the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Spirit. Then there are the ordinary gifts of the Spirit. "But the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal" (verse 7). The light of the Holy Spirit is the common heritage of all if they will receive it. "But all these worketh that one and the selfsame Spirit" (verse 11). "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body" (verse 13). Now we want, in the emblem or figure, something that in some way is like the reality. If it is not, it is not a good picture. Water, in the Scriptures, is used as an emblem of purity. "Except a man be born of water, and of

the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God" (John iii. 5). In this text the Spirit is the real purifier, and water is the emblem. In spiritual baptism the Holy Spirit is poured out upon man's spiritual nature. "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit" (Rom. viii. 16). In water baptism, which is the emblem, the water must be poured out upon man's physical nature. While Peter was preaching at the house of Cornelius the Holy Ghost was poured out upon the Gentiles, then he said: "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we" (Acts x. 47)? And when he had returned to Jerusalem, and in relating the matter to the other apostles, he said "the Holy Ghost fell on them as on us at the beginning." Then he remembered that the Lord had said, "John indeed baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost" (Acts xi. 16). As soon as they received the Holy Ghost baptism, which was the reality, he commanded them to be baptized with water, which was the emblem. We have here the emblem and the reality side by side. The real baptism was by pouring. We have the word of the Lord for that. In this baptism their spiritual natures were changed from a state of impurity to a state of purity.

The mode of the emblem baptism, if it is an emblem at all, must be like the mode of the real baptism. If Peter had said to these Gentile converts, You have received spiritual baptism, and that was by the Holy Spirit being poured out upon you, but now you must be dipped into water as an outward sign of that internal spiritual cleansing, it would have been quite a contradiction in terms. We make water baptism

"a sign or symbol of the baptism of the Holy Spirit, and the seal of the Covenant of Grace" (Confession of Faith, p. 55).

Dr. Carson says: "Without immersion there is no emblem of death, burial, and resurrection" (Carson on Baptism, p. 381). Paul makes the sacrament of the Lord's Supper the emblem of Christ's death. He says: "For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come" (1 Cor. xi. 26). Christ told his disciples that they should eat of the bread and drink of the cup, which were emblems of his body and blood "in remembrance of him;" not that they should be immersed to commemorate his death. Some people are very anxious to be immersed, as they call it, in order to represent the burial and resurrection of Christ. Christ was not buried as people now are. He was "laid in a sepulcher which was hewn out of a rock, and a stone rolled unto the door of the sepulcher." He lay in the sepulcher three days. Then an angel came down from heaven and rolled the stone from the door of the sepulcher. Then Jesus, by his own divine power, took his life again. He says: "I lay down my life, that I might take it again" (John x. 17). Now this person that is so anxious to be baptized just like Christ was buried, comes to the water, and after going in to a sufficient depth, is dipped into the water and taken out again as quickly as possible. We can see no resemblance, or likeness, or similarity between this transaction, and that of Christ being put into a new rock sepulcher, and after lying there three days, taking up his life again. One of the strangest of all the strange things, is to try to make water

baptism, and that a mere dipping, an emblem of Christ in a sepulcher for three days. John was not the Christ, nor was his baptism Christian baptism, but his work was to "prepare the way of the Lord." "I indeed have baptized you with water. And using as a formula: "Saying unto the people, that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus" (Acts xix. 4). "But he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost (Mark i. 8). John's baptism was an external rite, but it prefigured the baptism of the Holy Ghost. They are both baptisms, but they are not both baptisms in the same sense. One is the type, and the other is the anti-type.

Dr. Carson makes much ado over the fact that some writers claim that *baptizo* is sometimes used in the sense of pouring, and sometimes in the sense of sprinkling. He says: "If it is a pouring it cannot be a sprinkling" (Carson, p. 401). But he gives definitions to *baptizo* that are further apart in meaning than pouring and sprinkling. He says: "Baptism means to lay under water" (p. 21). *Baptizo* "always signifies to dip" (p. 55). A stone may lay under water for a thousand years, but dip is a momentary transaction. The two words are far apart in meaning, but he embraces them both in *baptizo*. Now I will prove that, as to mode, pouring and sprinkling are the same. "Moses took the anointing oil, . . . and he sprinkled thereof upon the altar seven times, and anointed the altar. . . . And he poured the anointing oil upon Aaron's head, and anointed him" (Lev. viii. 10, 11, 12). The oil came upon the altar, and it came upon Aaron's head. "For he maketh small the drops of water; they poured down rain according to the vapor thereof, which the clouds

do drop" (Job xxxvi. 27). When a cloud comes over and the drops of water begin to fall, we say it is sprinkling rain, and they increase, and continue to increase, until we say it is pouring down rain. Now it certainly comes within the range of possibilities that *baptizo* may include pouring and sprinkling both. The Bible speaks that way, and we speak that way, and it is that way.

SOME HISTORICAL FACTS CONSIDERED.

We will now present some historical facts which bear upon the subject of baptism. Some Baptist writers set up the claim that the Baptist church is the only true visible church in the world. Mr. Dayton, in *Theodosia Ernst*, p. 457, says of the Baptist churches, that he can "trace them back to John—must I say it?—and trace them back to John in Jordan." That is Mr. Dayton's line or succession.

Let us now hear Mr. Benedict, an eminent Baptist historian. Page 51, on "Succession of Churches," he says: "I shall not attempt to trace a continuous line of churches, as we can for a few centuries past in Europe and America. This is a kind of succession to which we have never laid claim; and of course we make no effort to prove it." That which Mr. Dayton could see with such a clear vision, Mr. Benedict could not see at all. They were both Baptist writers. Eusebius wrote a history of the Christian Church, embracing the period of time from the birth of Christ to A.D. 324. He speaks of baptism, but says nothing about immersion. He tells of a baptism that took place about the close of the first century under the ministry of the Apostle John. A reclaimed backslider, in making his confession to the apostle, shed tears freely, and Eusebius says he was baptized a second time with his own tears.

I will now give the testimony of Tertullian, as to the first beginning of immersion for baptism. In his

earlier ministry he belonged to the regular church, but about A.D. 199 he adopted the opinions of Montanus, and commenced preaching what he called the New Prophecy. The Montanists as a sect sprung up about the year 171. Montanus "pretended to inspiration, and gave out that the Holy Ghost had instructed him in several points which had not been revealed to the apostles." This is the New Prophecy that Tertullian embraced. He is now speaking of tradition. He says: "If no passage of Scripture has prescribed it, assuredly custom, which without doubt flowed from tradition, has confirmed it." He proposes now to speak of something that is not written, and that has no scriptural authority. Now he says: "To deal with this matter briefly, I shall begin with baptism." Christian baptism is written, and commanded in the New Testament, but he speaks of a baptism that is not written. "I shall begin with baptism. When we are going to enter the water, but a little before, in the presence of the congregation and under the hand of the president, we solemnly profess that we disown the devil, and his pomp, and his angels. Hereupon we are thrice immersed, making a somewhat ampler pledge than the Lord hath appointed in the gospel. Then, when we are taken up, we taste a mixture of milk and honey" (*Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. iii. p. 94). We have here a baptism, with a number of ceremonial additions, which Tertullian says is not written. Then on page 95 he says: "If, for these and other such rules, you insist upon having positive Scripture injunction, you will find none. Tradition will be held forth to you as the originator of them, custom as their strengthener, and faith as their observer." We have here the first his-

torical record of immersion, and with that trine immersion, and if we ask for scriptural authority we shall be told there is none. One page 103, under the head of Elucidations, is a quotation from Bunsen's Hippolytus, vol. iii., which says: "In baptism we use trine immersion, in honor of the trinal Name, after renouncing the devil and his angels and the pomps and vanities of his kingdom." Then on page 104 it is said: "He owns there is no Scripture for any of these usages, in which there was an amplification of the precepts of Christ." Dr. Carson says, on page 18: "It is true, indeed, that early church history shows that baptism was performed by three immersions, but it is equally true that this is not scriptural." He means that there is scriptural authority for one immersion, but not for the other two. How does he know that? They all came in at the same time, and Tertullian says there is no scriptural authority for any of it. He bases the whole question of immersion, whether one, or three, with all of its accompaniments, upon tradition. Soon after this custom was commenced it was thought that the subject ought to be baptized in a state of nudity. I will give a quotation from Dr. Robinson, the great Baptist historian. This is strictly a history of baptism. He says: "Let it be observed, next, that the primitive Christians baptized naked. Nothing is easier than to give proof of this by quotations from the authentic writings of the men who administered baptism, and who certainly knew in what way they performed it. There is no ancient historical fact better authenticated than this. The evidence doth not go on the meaning of the single word naked, for then a reader might suspect allegory, but on many facts reported and many

reasons assigned for the practice. [Here I omit five lines.] One of these facts is this: 'Basil rose up with fear and trembling, undressed himself, putting off the old man, and went down praying into the water, and the priest going down along with him baptized him. The reasons assigned for the practice are that Christians ought to put off the old man, before they put on a profession of Christianity, that as man came naked into the world, so they ought to come naked into the church, for the rich man could not enter the kingdom of heaven. That it was an imitation of Christ, who laid aside his glory and made himself of no reputation for them; and that Adam had forfeited all, and that Christians ought to profess to be restored to the enjoyment of all only by Jesus Christ. That most learned and accurate historian, James Basnage, than whom no man understood church history better, says: 'When artists threw garments over the pictures of the baptized, they consulted the taste of spectators more than the truth of the facts' " (Robinson's History of Baptism, pp. 94, 95).

Mr. Benedict, who wrote a History of the Baptists, says: "Mr. Robinson, in his History of Baptism, observes that there is no ancient historical fact better authenticated than the practice of baptizing naked. He ascribes it to the primitive Christians, by which however, he could not have meant those of the apostolic age, as there is nothing that looks like it in the New Testament accounts of administering this rite" (Benedict's History of the Baptists, p. 299).

It is true that we read nothing like this in "the apostolic age", and it is also true that we read nothing like immersion in "the apostolic age." Benedict quotes

Vossius, in his book *De Baptismo*, who says this practice continued for "a period of between seven and eight hundred years." Of course this practice was an innovation into the church, based upon superstition. And immersion itself was an innovation based upon tradition, as Tertullian tells us plainly; and along with that trine immersion, and other practices, for which he says there is no scriptural authority.

Mr. Dayton, author of *Theodosia Ernest*, sets forth another delusion in the following language: "Now to settle the question at once, I will take it upon me to trace the Baptist churches on the chart of history, either backward or forward. We will begin here to-day and trace them back to John." We are to have this question settled at once; to commence to-day, and trace them back from one to another until we come to the one that John organized. He is going to show us this "on the chart of history." In this list the Anabaptists, and the Mennonites, and Waldenses are all named. It is said, in the *Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, under the head of Mennonites: "We have now seen that the Baptists, who were formerly called Anabaptists, and in later times Mennonites, were the original Waldenses; and who have long in the history of the church received the honor of that origin. On this account the Baptists may be considered as the only Christian community which has stood since the days of the apostles, and as a Christian society which has preserved pure the doctrines of the gospel through all ages."

We have several points in this quotation worthy of note. It is said that the Baptist "were formerly called Anabaptists," then "Mennonites," and the "original Waldenses;" and that the Baptists, as a "Christian com-

munity," have "stood since the days of the apostles;" and as a "Christian society," they have "preserved pure the doctrines of the gospel through all ages." That covers all the ground. In preserving the gospel pure, immersion strictly for baptism must, of course, be included. And then there must be no infant baptisms. If these two points, as here stated, are lacking in the doctrines and practices of these people, then they are not Baptists, at least they are not the kind that we have now. In the first place, we shall gather some historical facts concerning the Anabaptists. They make a link in the great chain that extends from the apostolic age to A.D. 1899.

My quotations will be mainly, from a book written by W. H. Whitsitt, D.D., and called *A Question in Baptist History*. He quotes a number of authorities in confirmation of his positions, but I will simply give the page in his book where they can be found.

Dr. Whitsitt himself says, on page 35: "But none of the Anabaptists of Holland or of the adjacent sections of Germany were immersionists. So far as any account of them has come to light, they were uniformly in the practice of pouring or sprinkling for baptism, excepting the Collegiants, who at Rhynsburg began to immerse in 1620. In fact few Anabaptists anywhere were immersionists." He says: "Dr. Balthazar Hubmeier, one of their most worthy and influential leaders, describes the act of baptism as follows: 'To baptize in water is to pour outward water over the confessor of his sins, in accordance with the divine command, and to inscribe him in the number of sinners upon his own confession and acknowledgment. So has John baptized'" (pp. 35, 36). On page 36, Dr. Whitsitt quotes

from Burrage, p. 131, who says: "In April, 1525, it being Easter, the customary season for baptism, Hubmeier called his followers together and having sent for a pail of water solemnly baptized three hundred persons at one time." On the same page it is said: "Felix Mantz, another leader, also practiced pouring." And George Schad, after due repentance and confession of his sins, and having "asked for the token of brotherly love," "then submitted to have water poured upon him, and Felix Mantz was the person who baptized him."

"Then Hans Bruggbach, of Zumikon, stood up and cried out how great a sinner he was, and desired that they should pray to God for him. Then George Blaurock asked him whether he desired the grace of God. He replied, yes. Then Mantz stood up and said, Who shall hinder me from baptizing him? Then Blaurock answered, 'Nobody.' Thereupon Mantz *took a dipper of water and baptized him* in the name of God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost." Dr. Whitsitt says, on page 42, that "The Anabaptists of Holland appear to have been, without exception, engaged in the practice of pouring and sprinkling." The Anabaptists of Holland and Germany certainly form a very poor link in that Baptist chain of succession. It is said also on page 42 that "Hoffman practiced pouring," and that on one occasion "three hundred persons were baptized out of a large bucket, by him." On page 45, Bartholomew van den Berge, "being asked in what manner he was rebaptized, replied that the baptizer took water out of a small dish and spoke thus: 'I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost.'" Also a lady by the name of Heynen said that the "baptizer took spring water and

baptized her in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost." And Mathys Spangemecker said that "Herr Henrich baptized him with water upon his head," and that it was done "in the garret of the house." And Heynrick Tymmerman "says that while he was being baptized he was kneeling down upon his knees." In none of these cases of baptism was there any immersion. On page 48, Dr. Whitsitt says: "In conclusion, the general result may be stated that few Anabaptists of any country were immersionists, and that none of the Anabaptists of England in the sixteenth and first half of the seventeenth centuries were immersionists."

We will next consider the claim that the Baptists have upon the Mennonites. They are said to be "a society of Baptists in Holland, so called from Menno Simons." I suppose a statement by Menno Simons himself as to his belief is in place. On page 47, of Dr. Whitsitt's book, Menno says: "I certainly think that these and similar commands (to love one's enemies, to crucify the flesh and the lusts thereof) are more painful and burdensome to perverted flesh, which is everywhere so prone to walk in its own way, than it is to receive a handful of water." Then on the same page, Dr. Whitsitt, after speaking of the Anabaptists of Switzerland, says: "But there can be no question of the correctness of the contention that among the Mennonites or other Anabaptists of Holland and adjacent countries, there never existed at any period such a custom as immersion." That is very specific, and to the point. On page 55 Dr. Whitsitt speaks of two Confessions of Faith by the party of John Smyth, who were seeking a place among the Mennonites of Amsterdam, and two

of Helwys and his nine followers, struggling for a separate existence. Then he says: "We can perhaps find out what was the act of baptism among them by considering these documents in their historical setting. An important item of that historical setting is the fact already referred to that the Mennonites, with whom both parties were dealing, have never at any time or place been immersionists. They are unanimous in that contention, the most learned authorities as well as the common people." Then he quotes S. Muller, formerly one of the professors at the Mennonite College in Amsterdam, and author of many learned works, who says: "This mode of baptizing (sprinkling) was from the days of Menno the only usual mode amongst them, and it is still amongst us. The Waterlanders nor any other of the various parties of the Netherland Doopsgezinden practiced at any time baptism by immersion" (Evans, vol. i., p. 223). Then he says sprinkling was "the only usual mode," though pouring was sometimes employed; immersion was never resorted to at any time." Then again: "The testimony of Prof. Scheffer has already been given. He asserts without qualification that immersion was never in use among the Mennonites." There is none of that that has the appearance of Baptist doctrine. But the Mennonites are reckoned in the line of succession, by Mr. Dayton, from John the Baptist until now. A writer in the *Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge* says: "An account of the origin of the Dutch Baptists, or Mennonites, was published at Breda, in 1819. The Dutch Baptists, according to this writer, were the same as the Mennonites; but we have already seen that the Mennonites "have never at any time or place been immersionists." Now let us hear Dr. Robin-

son, the great historian, of the Baptist Church, on the Dutch Baptists. On page 498 he says: "The Dutch Baptists rejected infant baptism, and administered the ordinance only to such as professed faith and repentance; but they baptized by pouring." Rev. David Benedict, who wrote a History of the Baptists, says of the Anabaptists that "infant baptism they generally condemned. Some of them, however, continued in the practice after the name of Anabaptist was applied to them; and as to the mode of baptism, it is certain that the Anabaptists were not all dippers, as the following quotation will show." Then he says: "The first recorded instance of rebaptism took place at Zwickan, near Zurich, in 1525, and then (says the person in whose house the ceremony was performed) they were all baptized with a dipper." Then he says that Hubmeier baptized about three hundred with "water that was brought in a milk pail" (Benedict's History of the Baptists, p. 931). On page 911 Benedict says: "The Mennonites, in the Old World, for ages past, have, as a general thing, administered baptism by pouring and laying on of hands; and the same is true of them in this country, both of the old and new connection."

The array of historical facts which we have now presented, and which establishes the fact that the Anabaptists, the Dutch Baptists, and Mennonites were not immersionists, makes a break in the Baptist succession theory that can never be mended. It is worthy of note that Menno and Hubmeier were both ex-Roman Catholic priests, and Peter De Bruis was a Roman Catholic. It is said of Peter De Bruis that "he is justly claimed by modern Baptists as belonging to their fraternity." Menno at the age of twenty-four years "entered into

orders as a Romish priest." He continued in this position about two years and nine months; he then renounced Romanism and infant baptism, but always baptized by pouring and sprinkling. We have noticed heretofore that Menno was the founder of the sect called Mennonites, and that the Mennonites were a part of that "Baptist community which have stood since the days of the apostles." Hubmeier left the Romish Church, and part of his congregation went with him, and Benedict says on "rebaptizing his church at Waldshut," three hundred were baptized with water "brought in a milk pail." Dr. Wall dates this transaction A.D. 1522. Now these Anabaptists all came from the Roman Catholics.

The Waldenses are also claimed in this line of succession from the apostolic age to the present time. That is the last link in the chain. It is claimed that they never did have any connection with the church of Rome. I am willing to grant that point. And I am ready to grant also that that is not the only church they never had any connection with. I will now prove from Perrin's history of the Waldenses that they were pedobaptists. He was a descendant of that people himself, and after gathering up all of their unpublished manuscripts, their sermons, and their confessions of faith that he could find he wrote their history. In this history Perrin gives a well authenticated Confession of Faith, copied out of their own manuscripts bearing date A.D. 1120. Then he gives a document called "The Noble Lesson," which he translated from an authentic manuscript in the original Waldenison language, dated A.D. 1100. In that lesson, it is said: "One thousand

and one hundred years are now completed since it was written, 'It is the last time.'"

In order to render the Waldenses obnoxious to their king, the Romish priests sometime in the twelfth century brought against them fourteen charges of crimes, as they supposed, which are given in detail by Perrin, p. 26. The fourth one is: "That they rejected the baptism of infants." The Waldenses answered these charges in writing, one by one, and sent their answer to the king that the falsity of the charges might appear to him. Perrin says that he had their apology in their own tongue, and from it he copies their answer, p. 28: "The fourth calumny was concerning baptism, which it is said they denied to infants. From this imputation they quit themselves as follows: 'Neither is the time or place appointed for those who must be baptized; but charity, and the edification of the church and congregation, ought to be the rule in this matter; yet, notwithstanding, we bring our *children to be baptized*; which they ought to do to whom they are nearest related; as their parents, or those whom God hath inspired with such a charity.'"

Their answer is specific and unequivocal. Now these people are claimed as Baptists. But one thing is very sure, and that is, that they were not the kind of Baptists that we have now.

"King Louis XII., of France," being informed by "the enemies of the Waldenses dwelling in Provence," that they were guilty of certain crimes, sent to the place one Adam Fumee, and a Sorbonist doctor, called Parni, who examined into the matter, and reported that the Waldenses were not guilty as charged; but rather that they kept the Sabbath duly, caused their children to be baptized according to the primitive church, taught

them the articles of the Christian faith, and the commandments of God" (Perrin, p. 36). These men not only reported that they had their children baptized, but that it was "according to the primitive church." This took place, A.D. 1506. William Jones, who wrote a History of the Christian Church, and an account of the Waldenses and Albigenses, published by Ephraim A. Smith, A.D. 1831, on page 338, makes this quotation from Perrin, and where Perrin says "caused their children to be baptized according to the primitive church," he says: "Observed the ordinance of baptism according to the primitive church." The only possible reason that could be given for making this perverted quotation, was to make it appear that the Waldenses were anti-pedobaptists, and not pedobaptists. In the year 1535 the Waldenses held a convention, the twelfth day of September, just after a severe persecution, for the purpose of readopting articles of faith; and in that convention every family was represented, and all their pastors, out of all their valleys were present. The 17th article of the Confession of Faith that was adopted by the convention relates to the sacraments. They say one of these, "is baptism, and the other is the Lord's Supper, which we receive to demonstrate our perseverance in the faith, according to the promise we made in our baptism in our infancy" (Perrin, p. 82). They say of the articles drawn up by this assembly, that they "were ordered read, and approved, and unanimously signed and sworn to by all the assistants, as what they would preserve, observe, believe, and inviolably retain among them, without any contradiction;" and that this "doctrine had been delivered from father to son among them, and taken out of the word of God." They say

in this Confession of Faith that they were all baptized in infancy. Perrin gives a Confession of Faith of the Waldenses, copied out of manuscripts bearing date A.D. 1120. In this they say: "We acknowledge no other sacrament than baptism and the Lord's Supper." They then give a brief exposition of the sacraments. They say a "sacrament is an invisible grace, represented by a visible thing." Then in speaking of how baptism should be performed, and why it should be, they say: "And for this cause it is, that we present our children in baptism" (Perrin, p. 231).

I have now given some plain, pointed historical facts, which show beyond question that the Waldenses were pedobaptists. I could give many more of the same kind if it were necessary; but that would only increase the volume of evidence without making it any stronger.

I wish to give one quotation from Dr. Bray, who wrote a History of the Waldenses, and in speaking of the sacraments he says: "The first sacrament is called baptism, viz., a washing or sprinkling of water, which must be administered in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost" (p. 292). There is not a line, or word, in Perrin's history, that can be construed so as to make it appear that the Waldenses were not pedobaptists. Jones, whom I have before quoted, and who also wrote a History of the Waldenses, says of Perrin that he "was a writer of unimpeachable veracity." In his history he quotes from Perrin a great deal as authority, and yet he leaves out, or changes, every word, or line, and sometimes a whole article in a Confession of Faith is left out, so as to make it appear that the Waldenses were anti-pedobaptists and not pedobaptists. I have both histories and I know whereof I speak.

Now this same pedobaptist denomination of Waldenses is counted in the line of the "Baptists that may be considered as the only Christian community which has stood since the days of the apostles." The historical facts which now stand upon these pages show that there is no such community; that is one of the obsolete myths in ecclesiastical history.

We now make some concluding remarks.

1. It is a well authenticated historical fact that although the Dutch Baptists, the Anabaptists, and the Mennonites, all rejected infant baptism, yet they all baptized by pouring and sprinkling. This is well established by such Baptist historians, as Dr. Robinson, David Benedict, and numerous quotations made by Dr. Whitsitt.

2. It is also a fact worthy of observation that Peter De Bruis, Simon Menno, and Hubmeier, had all been Roman Catholic priests; and whatever of validity there was in the baptism that they administered to their followers, was derived from the Roman Catholic Church. Some Baptist writers disclaim all connection whatever with the Roman Church, and yet they claim these very people as their ancestors. If they claim the Anabaptists, the Dutch Baptists, and the Mennonites, then they ought to admit that they owe their origin to the Roman Catholic Church.

3. Church history shows that the Waldenses never had any connection with the Roman Catholic Church, as to their origin, or in any other way. It also shows that they were intensely pedobaptists in their belief, and never had any connection with the Baptist Church.

ADDENDA.

Some additional facts may be very appropriately considered in the conclusion of this discussion. Some historical facts have been presented already, and I will now give a few more that will awaken thought. When did the Baptist Church first take form as an organization? I have previously quoted from some writers who say that it was during the ministry of John the Baptist. And these same writers claim an unbroken succession of Baptist churches to the present time. During the first half of the 17th century there were two separate and distinct Baptist churches organized.

First. The General Baptist Church. Dr. Lofton quotes from Dr. Joseph Angus (Baptist Handbook, 1898), who says: "The earliest General Baptist churches of which any history is known were founded about 1611-14" (English Baptist Reformation, p 36). Dr. Lofton on the same page says: "Really the first English Baptist church, so called, began its existence in 1609, in Holland, and was transplanted to London in 1611." "It originated with John Smyth and his followers." Smyth had been a minister in the Established Church, but he left that church "on account of his inclination to Puritanism, and his opposition to the corruptions of the English Church." The Puritans were pedo-baptists, as was also the English Church. He became dissatisfied with "infant baptism." He then separated from the Puritans, as he had formerly sepa-

rated from the Church of England. He finally "dissolved his own church and proceeded to reorganize anew upon the Baptist model, which is based upon a regenerate church membership and believers' baptism" (English Baptist Reformation, p. 29). Having now renounced all previous church fellowship, the question of baptism came up for consideration. The conclusion was that there was "not a true scriptural church on earth," and consequently no true or valid baptism. The decision was that "Smyth should baptize himself, and then baptize the rest of his company in communion, after each had made his confession of faith in Christ; and it was then through the act of baptism that the church was constituted" (English Baptist Reformation, p. 36). Then Dr. Lofton says (on some page): "The work was done—the true baptism and church were recovered, and thus was organized and set up the first English Church, after the Baptist model, which has had any succession to modern times." Smyth baptized himself. In a work written by Smyth himself in A.D. 1609, which is named the "Character of the Beast," he defends his act, and says: "A man cannot baptize others into the church, himself being out of the church. Therefore it is lawful for a man to baptize himself together with others in communion, and this warrant is plerophory for the practice which is done by us." In this quotation Smyth plainly admits that he baptized himself. He had been baptized in his infancy, but he repudiates this on the ground that it was not believers' baptism. By what mode did Smyth baptize himself and "the rest of his company?" Dr. Lofton (p. 45) quotes from Robert Ashton (1851) in his edition of the Works of John Robinson (vol. iii., p. 461, Ap-

pendix) as saying: "It is a rather singular fact that zealous as were Mr. Smyth and his friends for believers' baptism, and earnest as were their opponents in behalf of infant baptism, the question of the mode of baptism was never mooted by either party." Then on the same page: "Incidental allusions there are, in their own works and in the replies of Robinson, that the baptism which Mr. Smyth performed on himself must have been rather by affusion, or pouring. Nor is this supposition improbable, from the fact that the Dutch Baptists by whom they were surrounded uniformly administered baptism by affusion."

In a short time Smyth became satisfied that his self-baptism was a mistake, and he, with a part of his church, sought admission into the Mennonite Church. The Mennonites have always baptized by pouring or sprinkling, and never by immersion. "The Mennonite ministers appointed to examine Smyth and his party," reported that "the said English were questioned about their doctrine of salvation and the ground and form (mode) of their baptism, and no difference was found between them and us." Smyth died in 1612, A.D., but had not, as yet been received into the Mennonite Church. Muller says, as quoted by Evans (vol. i., p. 223) that "after Smith's decease, his faction was received into full fellowship in this Mennonite Church—the unbaptized portion of it being admitted by sprinkling and not immersion."

But what became of those members of Smyth's Church who did not go to the Mennonites? The answer is given in "A question in Baptist History" (p. 52): "Thirty-two people had set their hands to the petition desiring admission to the Mennonite com-

munion. The others, eight or ten in number, refused to take such a step. They regarded the movement toward the Mennonites in the light of a sin against the Holy Spirit. It was their intention to remain where they were and walk in the light whereunto they had attained. That small company by bravely standing their ground at a critical period became the founders of the body of Christian people which subsequently acquired the title of General Baptists in England." The history is "that not above ten persons were of the party." The male members were Thomas Helwys, William Piggott, Thomas Seamer, and John Murton, the others being, as is supposed, females. (See Evans, vol. i., p. 210.) This small body of people held that their baptism was valid, notwithstanding they were baptized by John Smyth, and he baptized himself.

Perhaps the General Baptists would not now be willing to receive baptism at the hands of one who had baptized himself, but in tracing their lineage that is the point to which they come. They held the doctrine of a general atonement, and do now. They also baptized by pouring or sprinkling from A.D. 1611 to A.D. 1640. They rejected the doctrine of infant baptism, and held to the doctrine of free communion. There is nothing in history that carries them beyond A.D. 1611.

THE ORIGIN OF THE PARTICULAR OR CALVINISTIC BAPTISTS.

The time at which this organization was effected is put down in history as A.D. 1633. "Thomas Crosby, the first English Baptist historian," is quoted in English Baptist Reformation (p. 55) as saying: "In the

year 1633 the Baptists who had hitherto been intermixed among other Protestant Dissenters, without distinction, and so consequently shared with the Puritans all the persecutions of those times, began now to separate themselves, and form distinct societies of those of *their* own persuasion." All that can be said of the men who went into this organization, is, that they held to *some* doctrines that were peculiar to the Baptists. Dr. Lofton says (English Baptist Reformation, p. 55): "If there were such 'intermixed' Baptists they were unorganized and had no churches of their own." He says (on the same page): "They were different in kind from the General Baptists." The General Baptists held to some of the peculiarities of the Mennonites. "The Particular Baptists . . . inherited from their Puritan ancestors the mixed church and communion fallacy" (ibid). Dr. Lofton says (p. 56) that Crosby "for his account of the Particular Baptists cites the so-called Kiffin Manuscript, or the Jessey Records, as his authority, from which he collects the following facts: On the 12th of September, 1633, there was a secession from the Jacob-Lathrop (Independent) Church of the people he calls 'Baptist.'" It is elsewhere said that the word "Baptist" is not in the "Manuscript."

Crosby says that this secession was based chiefly upon the ground that "baptism was not rightly administered to infants." The old Jacob-Lathrop Church was so called because its first pastor was a man by the name of Jacob, and its second pastor was named Lathrop. This church was founded in 1616 A.D., but was in no sense a Baptist Church at that time. It was an Independent or Puritan Church, and administered baptism by sprinkling. Dr. Lofton says (p. 57) that, "Ac-

cording to the tract, 'To Sion's Virgins,' the mode of baptism in the Lathrop Church was unquestionably sprinkling." It also baptized infants. It is a historical fact that the John Smyth church, and the Lathrop Church, "were the twin mothers of the Baptist denominations—especially General and Particular—in England" (Dr. Lofton, p. 58). "As a denomination of people the English Anabaptists, if Crosby and the Jessey Records are true—yea, if all the Baptist writers who touch the subject in the seventeenth century are true, did not practice immersion between 1611 and 1641; and inferentially they practiced sprinkling and pouring as a fact well known" (English Baptist Reformation, p. 63). The Particular Baptists held to the doctrine of a limited atonement and special election. They, like the General Baptists, rejected infant baptism, and baptized by pouring and sprinkling until 1640. If there had been a succession of Baptist churches from the apostles to A.D. 1640, it is altogether out of reason that these Baptist churches would be baptizing by pouring and sprinkling at the same time. It is shown by Crosby that "when the English Anabaptists organized their churches in 1611-1633, they did not practice immersion" (Dr. Lofton, p. 74). "Therefore Baptists and Baptist immersion, from the first centuries, had no unbroken succession in England" (ibid). Dr. Lofton says (p. 73): "So far as Crosby, or any other historian can show, there is a hiatus of 1241 years in English history in which there is not an allusion to Baptist immersion." Crosby claims that the British Christians of the first three hundred years were Baptists and practiced immersion; but at the end of that time Baptist immersion was lost, because the churches ceased to be

Baptist churches. He claims that immersion as a Baptist rite was entirely lost. It is said "the Poland Anabaptists restored immersion in 1574. The Collegiants of Holland restored it in 1620. The Collegiants may have received the ordinance from the Poles, and the Poles from the Swiss Anabaptists, and the Swiss from the Waldenses, and these last from those who continued it from the apostles" (English Baptist Reformation, pp. 73, 74). That is only a supposition that the Collegiants received immersion as here stated. There is no history sustaining the supposition. And besides that the Waldenses never, at any time, were Baptists, either as to the subject or mode of baptism.

Dr. Lofton says that Crosby wrote the Preface to vol. ii. of his history "for the express purpose of tracing the history of immersion in England; and he did all that could be done for Baptists in showing their practice for the first three hundred years, and their return to the lost practice in 1640-41" (p. 75). According to Crosby, and other Baptist writers of his time and later, the Baptist denomination has no connection with the church in the apostolic times. Dr. Lofton says (p. 77) that "Crosby, with all the English Baptist writers I have read, repudiates the doctrine of visible succession, in any form, among Baptists." The "Montanists, Novations, Donatists, Paulicians, and the like," says Dr. Lofton, have been spoken of as Baptists, "who would not now be fellowshipped, ecclesiastically speaking, in any regular Baptist Church in America."

The point is settled by Baptist historians, that there is no visible succession of Baptist churches from the apostles, and that immersion has been lost. Crosby says that immersion, along with the baptism of infants,

was practiced in the Roman Catholic Church, and also in the Church of England, but as to Baptist churches and Baptist immersion, there were none for a period of 1241 years. Eusebius, who was born A.D. 270, a man of great learning, wrote a history of the Christian Church from the birth of Christ to the year 324 A.D., and in that he says not one word about Baptist churches nor Baptist immersion.

But Baptist immersion being lost, and consequently valid baptism being also lost, how was it restored? In 1640 the question of a proper administrator was raised. How shall we begin? No one was authorized to immerse the first man. If an authorized administrator could have been found the difficulty would have been solved. There were men who had been baptized in infancy, and others who had been baptized at adult age by affusion, but none by immersion. Crosby is quoted by Dr. Lofton (p. 61) as saying: "They could not be satisfied about any administrator (proper or irregular) in England to begin this practice; because though some in this nation rejected baptism of infants (Anabaptists), yet they had not as they knew of revived the ancient custom of immersion." Self-baptism, as was administered by John Smyth, was considered and disapproved.

The next proposition was to send some one to the Collegiants in Holland, in order to receive immersion at their hands. Consequently, "Richard Blunt was deputed to the Netherlands, where he received immersion from John Batten, of the Collegiants, and who upon his return baptized Blacklock, they two baptizing the rest that 'were so minded,' to the number of fifty-three persons, whose names are given in the document, January 9, 1641" (Dr. Lofton, p. 61). But the sending of

Blunt to Holland to receive immersion was not acceptable to the people. Crosby says: "That 'the largest number and the more judicious of the English Baptists repudiated this method and adopted the anti-succession or irregular method of restoration' (English Baptist Reformation, p. 67). The Collegiants had been in the practice of immersion only twenty years, and receiving it at their hands was no better than receiving it of any one else. But the theory of succession from the apostles is now repudiated by the greatest number of the English Baptists, and the more judicious.' They held that 'after an universal corruption' of baptism, and when 'no continuance of adult baptism can be proved,' as was the case at that time, the ordinance could be restored by an unbaptized administrator, as was 'John the Baptist'" (English Baptist Reformation, p. 86). They believed that any one who had the right to preach the gospel had the right also to originate baptism if it were necessary. "Crosby wholly proves that the Baptists of England have no organic succession before 1611, 1633, and no baptismal succession before a 'later' date, this side of their organization" (English Baptist Reformation, pp. 87, 88). There does not appear to have been any difference between the General and Particular Baptists in their efforts to restore Baptist immersion. The first person who was immersed was by one who had not himself been immersed, but this was held to be scriptural baptism, because it was ordered by the general body of believers in Christ. "Succession," which has been held by Baptists for a hundred years or more, is now declared to be an "irrational and unscriptural tradition." It is now claimed, and maintained, that the baptism which had a "beginning" with

this man who was himself unbaptized, is the baptism which has a succession to the present time. It is said, in English Baptist Reformation (p. 252), of the first Baptists of England: "They admit that they originated their baptism and erected their churches anew, at the hands of unbaptized administrators." "They deny organic, baptismal or ministerial connection with prior Anabaptists."

They seem to have been generally united and agreed on two things only, to wit: baptism by immersion to adult believers in Christ alone, and opposition to "succession." On many other doctrines they were far apart, and are so yet. But now they are very much divided upon the theory of succession. The word "Baptist," at this period of its history, is a certain index to only two things: i. e. baptism by immersion and the rejection of infant baptism.

I have now given a very brief account of the origin of the first and second Baptist churches of which history has anything at all to say. A great many historical facts bearing on the same points might yet be given, but it is deemed unnecessary. At a much later date the Particular or Calvinistic Baptists split upon the question of foreign missions, and the Missionary Baptist Church came into existence as a result of that separation. Since that separation the ante-Missionary Baptists have declined, and the Missionary Baptists have increased in numbers.

MAY 12 1978

SMITH, M M 741
The mode of Christian ~~8~~655mo
baptism. 1899

